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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. The research objectives which guided this study were to determine the influence of language of instruction on participation of refugee students; to establish the influence of subject content on participation of refugee students; to examine the influence of teaching methods on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools; and finally to determine the influence of instructional resources on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools. Descriptive survey design was used to gather data for the study. The target population included all seven public secondary schools in Kamkunji sub-county. The sample was drawn from five schools after two schools were randomly selected for piloting. The sample included 266 refugee students purposively sampled and 37 teachers randomly selected. The study employed two sets of questionnaires to gather data; one for teachers and the other for students. Both questionnaires contained open-ended and closed items. Both inferential and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data with the aid of SPSS computer program version 21. The study found that language of instruction influenced and was a barrier to the participation of refugee students in school. The study also found that subject content influenced participation of refugee students in school activities with a correlation of 0.59. The study also found that teaching methods influenced participation of refugee students with a Pearson correlation of 0.58. Finally, the study found that instructional resources influenced participation of refugee students and that dictionaries and textbooks significantly contributed to the participation of refugee students. The study concluded that school based factors influence participation of refugee students in school. The study recommended that those schools serving a large number of refugee students initiate after school tutoring programs targeting refugee students. The study also recommends that bilingual dictionaries be made available in schools.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (2016), there are 65.3 million people who have been forced from their home as a result of armed conflict, persecution, natural disasters and economic hardship. Of these, 21.3 million are refugees, over half of whom are under the age of 18 (UNHCR, 2016). Out of the numbers of young refugees, more than 10.65 million need access to basic services such as health care and education. Due to the rapid process of urbanization, two thirds of refugees around the world now live in cities compared to only one third living in refugee camps (UNHCR, 2015). Refugees are drawn to the prospect of finding work in cities and accessing social amenities such as health care and education for their children. In urban areas, education may play a critical role for social integration and help those coming from rural areas to garner the necessary skills to become economically competitive (UNHCR, 2009).

The UNHCR (2016) advocates for a rights based approach to education for refugees. This approach stems from Article 22 of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees that states that:

The Contracting States shall accord to refugees treatment as favorable as possible, and, in any event, not less favorable than that accorded to aliens generally in the same circumstances, with respect to education other than elementary education and, in particular, as regards access to studies, the recognition of foreign school certificates, diplomas and degrees, the remission of fees and charges and the award of scholarships. (p. 24).
In addition to the various benefits of education for refugee youth and children, education also provides an essential context where the host country’s culture is introduced and learned. It is also where most of the integration into the new society takes place (Kanu, 2008).

The success of refugee students at secondary school is dependent on various variables which can be academic, economic and/or psychosocial (Kanu, 2008). Refugee children may be willing and ready to learn at school, but they typically need to be shown how to learn in a new language within a different curriculum and social context (Yarrow, 2012). Moreover, Kanu (2008) argues that social and cultural issues are closely linked to language and curricula. That is, the transfer of social values and norms takes place within the realm of language and school curricula.

Ahlstrom (2010) defines participation as taking part in both academic and non-academic activities in and outside of the school. Inside the classroom, participation is characterized by students speaking up, raising and answering questions, engaging in classroom discussions and completing projects and homework on time. Outside the classroom, participation is categorized by belonging to sports and other clubs such as drama and debate teams. Shernoff, Csikszentmihalyi, Schneider, and Shernoff (2003) suggest that school classroom participation is closely associated with high involvement in lessons, directed concentration, interest and enjoyment opposed to apathy, boredom and disinterest.
A study by the Women’s Resettled Refugee Commission (2009) in Arizona, United States of America found that language barrier was the single greatest obstacle to successful assimilation of refugee students in the community and the ability to succeed in school. Other barriers may include alien curricula, lack of individualized attention from teachers, and lack of academic support at home. Trauma and unpleasant experiences compound the difficulties that refugee students face in acculturation, language acquisition and academic success (Collier, 1995). Yarrow (2012) suggests that compared to elementary and middle school pupils, who do not face stressful academic pressure and generally learn English quickly, high school refugee students struggle to cope with the demanding academic requirements in a short period. Many of these refugee students are expected to master content that native students have been exposed to since lower levels.

Language is a recurrent theme in refugee education because it is the medium through which knowledge, values, and skills are transmitted. In Canada, English learning has been considered the biggest challenge for refugee students and thus impeding their success in school (Yu, 2012). Students are bound to have difficulties in school if the language spoken at home is different from that used as medium of instruction in school. Furthermore, Yu observes that new refugee students’ participation in classroom activities was limited and they often seemed withdrawn.
In South Africa, Sobantu and Warria (2013) found that language-related challenges such as learning a second language, learning English in itself, and interacting with peers and teachers in English may have overwhelmed the participants and greatly undermined their development and academic coping ability. When students are not proficient in the language of instruction, they are likely to have lower self-esteem, lack confidence, avoid classroom discussion and isolate themselves (Windle & Miller, 2012).

Teachers are imperative to the success of refugee students in secondary schools. The kind of teaching methods teachers employ in classrooms can either engage and captivate students resulting in mastery of content or disinterest them and ultimately lead to poor academic performance. Teaching and communicating with refugee students who had limited English language competency, and who did not identify with the curriculum was a challenge to the teachers in South Africa (Pausigere, 2010).

A study by the Commonwealth Secretariat (2013) found that most teachers of refugees in developing countries are under-qualified and lack experience. This, undoubtedly, impacts the academic performance of refugee students. Furthermore, Dryden-Peterson (2015) reports that instruction of refugee students is dominated by teacher-centered methodologies such as lecturing and question-answer sessions. Students are not given initiative and interaction amongst them is
minimal. This type of instructional methodology does not promote engagement of students and hinders their participation.

In a study investigating participation of students in the classroom, Atieno (2014) reports that instructional resources such as flip charts and games facilitate student participation and contribute towards achieving a meaning learning experience. Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005), in a study on the participation of African refugee students in Australian classrooms, observed that bilingual dictionaries assisted in facilitating classroom discussions. African refugee students who could use the dictionaries contributed to the discussion and showed enthusiasm towards learning. In a study into refugee-serving schools in Kenya, Dryden-Peterson (2015) reported that teachers only had the assigned textbook as instructional resources and this reduced interaction and participation of refugee students in the classroom.

Kenya is host to 597,683 refugees with 418,379 of those coming from Somalia and 64,212 of them living in Nairobi (UNHCR, 2016). Munyua (2014) states that many of these refugees are only fluent in their own language and yet most schools use the two national languages used in Kenya; English and Kiswahili. This means that they have to adjust to not only a new language but also a new curriculum. The subject content taught in Kenyan schools may be significantly different from the one which they have been exposed to in their home countries. In addition, they
may need individualized attention from the teachers which is hard to come by in public schools (Munyua, 2014).

A study carried out by Karanja (2010) in a Sudanese refugees’ school (Baraka School) in Nairobi found that the Kenyan curriculum used in Baraka school was found to lack components that addressed the special needs of refugee children such as psychosocial needs and practical knowledge and survival skills. Hammond (2012) advocates for curriculum content that is suitable for refugee learners and supports their learning across subjects.

Refugee students from Somalia enrolled in public secondary schools in Kamukunji Sub-county, Kenya. are faced with many challenges including adapting to a fast-paced curriculum, academic gaps due to disrupted schooling, limited English language proficiency, different academic expectations, and lack of support from teachers (Nthiga, 2013). These challenges are major constraints to refugee students’ participation in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Literature on refugee students’ participation in school activities is very scanty. Most studies on refugee education in Kenya focus on access and neglect the important component of participation in school activities. There have been concerted efforts by non-governmental organizations such as Lutheran World Federation (LWF), The United States Agency for International Aid (USAID) and
Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) International at supporting the Kenyan government provide access to education for refugees. The quality of education and learning activities provided to refugee students in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya still remains an area to explore.

In Eastleigh, an area within Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, up to 70% of public schools students are from refugee families (Pavanello, Elhawary & Pantuliano, 2010). According to the Director of Education in Kamukunji sub-county, participation of refugee students in classroom and co-curricular activities was markedly less than native Kenyan students (DoE, 2016). Therefore this study sought to investigate the school-based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate school-based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study were:

i. To determine the influence of language of instruction on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.
ii. To establish the influence of subject content on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

iii. To examine the influence of teaching methods on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

iv. To determine the influence of instructional resources on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

1.5 Research questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:

i. What is the influence of language of instruction on participation of refugee student in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya?

ii. How does subject content influence participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya?

iii. To what extent do teaching methods influence participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya?

iv. To what extent do instructional resources influence participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya?
1.6 Significance of the study

The study has yielded information that may contribute to future curriculum reviews in Kenya by providing insights and recommendations as to how best to accommodate refugee students in Kenya. The study also highlighted curriculum areas which impact on the participation of refugee students and how can they be mitigated by informing decision makers on challenges and difficulties faced by refugee students in Kenya. This may benefit teachers in refugee-serving schools as to how best increase the participation of their students. The study may provide information to policy makers and donor agencies on curriculum related factors that can improve the participation of refugee students in public secondary schools.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The study was limited in the sense that some refugee students did not understand some items on the questionnaire. Also refugee students were sharing information while filling out the questionnaires which could have jeopardized the objectivity of the findings. The researcher was there to answer any questions the respondents had however to mitigate this limitation the researcher collected enough data using the qualitative and quantitative research instruments to maximize on information being sought.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

This study was conducted in five public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. This was due to the concentration of refugee students in
this area. The target population of the study was confined to refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county. This ensured that the research population was identified faster, more easily and accurately. The topic of investigation was focused on the influence of language if instruction, subject content, teaching methods and instructional resources on the participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county. This was to ensure both focus and to control other extraneous variables which may also impact the dependent variable.

1.9 Assumptions of the study

This study was carried out under the following assumptions:

i. Refugee students would know the factors affecting their participation in school activities.

ii. Teachers would voluntarily participate in the study and give factual information.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

The following are definitions of significant terms as used in the study.

**Host country** refers to a country that hosts refugees fleeing violence and persecution and provides them with safety and other social services.

**Language** refers to the speech of a country, region, or group of people, including its vocabulary, syntax and grammar.

**Language of instruction** refers to the language used by the teacher to teach.
Mainstream classes refer to classes where students do not have disabilities that may require special needs.

Participation refers to the action of taking part in academic and non-academic activities in and outside of the school.

Refugees refer to people fleeing conflict or persecution. They are defined and protected in international law, and must not be expelled or returned to situations where their life and freedom are at risk.

Subject content refers to a defined domain of knowledge and skill in an academic program.

Teaching methods refer to techniques for achieving lesson objectives and may include talking and chalking, acting in drama, role playing and organizing projects.

Teaching and learning materials refer to the resources used to facilitate teaching and learning. These may include books, blackboard, charts, games, projectors and computers.

1.11 Organization of the study

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter is the introductory chapter comprising of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives and questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, definition of significant terms and organization of the study. The second chapter covers review of the literature related to the school based factors influencing participation of
refugee students in secondary schools, summary of the literature review, and theoretical and conceptual frameworks. The third chapter details the research methodology including research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures and analysis techniques, and ethical considerations that will be used in the study. The fourth chapter covers data presentation, interpretation and discussion while the fifth chapter is the summary, conclusion and recommendations. Suggestions for further research are presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section covers the literature review relating to school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in secondary schools. The review of literature focuses on the influence of English as a medium of instruction, subject content, teaching methods, and instructional resources on refugee students’ participation in secondary schools. A summary of the literature review is presented in this section. The section concludes with the theoretical and conceptual frameworks on which the study will be based.

2.2 Urban refugees in Kenya

While majority of refugees in Kenya stay in Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps, tens of thousands of them live in Nairobi (UNHCR, 2016). Refugees are drawn to urban centers for such social services as education and health as well as increased economic opportunities. However, urban refugees face discrimination, harassment from police, and poverty (UNHCR, 2016). Somali and Ethiopian refugees are largely concentrated in the Eastleigh area of Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, South Sudanese refugees are scattered across areas such as Dagorreti, Kikuyu town and Githurai (Pavanello, Elhawary & Pantuliano, 2010).

Urban refugees do not always enjoy a satisfying life in Nairobi because most of them lack documentation which is the basis for their legal protection. Those who are able to prove their legal status may avoid arrest, extortion by police, and abuse
(Munya, 2014). As a result, obtaining basic services such as medical care and education becomes difficult for most urban refugees in Nairobi.

2.3 The concept of student participation

Participation in school refers to taking part in both academic and non-academic activities in and out of the school (Ahlstrom, 2010).

Participation is categorized by factors such as classroom attendance, completion of homework, involvement in classroom discussions, and engagement in co-curricular activities. Ahlstrom (2010) states that student participation encompasses practicing democracy and engaging in decision-making processes. For this to occur, students must develop skills in communication, problem solving and negotiation. Participation transcends the mere classroom interaction amongst students and with their teacher. Student participation leads to a wider understanding of how society works and how to treat other people (Norberg, 2009).

In a study into student participation in schools, Goodenow (1993) notes that students’ participation in schools encompasses both behavioral and psychological components. The behavioral component deals with participation in school activities such as belonging to the drama club or debate team; it involves active participation in school activities. The psychological aspect of student participation in school deals with students’ sense of belonging and acceptance of school values. The underlying implication of the psychological component of student
participation is the belief in the benefits that the school offers in the long term. This leads to students internalizing that education will benefit them personally, socially and economically (Johnson, 2001).

Lack of the psychological component of student participation; that is the absence of a sense of a belonging and rejection of school values leads students to become disenfranchised, excluded and alienated (Goodenow, 1993). This will ultimately result in students withdrawing from school and/or engaging in disruptive behavior. Teachers and school administrators must be aware of factors that may cause students to lose interest in participating in school.

Student participation in school marks an internal drive towards learning, engaging in social activities, working with peers, and a healthy sense of belonging. This leads to a strong desire to excel academically. Since student participation can be linked to the long term success of students, it must be considered as an important component of school objectives (Goodenow, 1993).

2.4 Language of instruction and participation of refugee students

Education is a lifeline for refugee students as it provides them with a sense of hope and normality as well as physical and psychosocial protection. In order for students to achieve these important benefits, they must be engaged in the educational process. The medium of instruction plays a pivotal role in the delivery of knowledge, skills and attitudes. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR, 2009) advocates for the language of instruction to be that of
the country of origin with additional time devoted to teaching the language of the host country.

In a study investigating language of instruction and refugee students, Gibbons (2009) makes a distinction between everyday conversational English, which is easily acquired by refugee students simply as a result of mixing with English speaking peers, and academic English which is necessary for control of academic literacy in specific academic areas. In another major study, MacNevin (2012) found that lack of proficiency in English was a detriment to refugee students’ overall participation in mainstream classes in Canadian secondary schools. Refugee students were not able to cope with the fast pace of lessons. MacNevin (2012) adds that there were constant breakdowns in communication between these refugee students and their teachers. Similarly, Kanu (2008) observes that “limited English language proficiency” was a barrier to refugee students’ academic success as well as participation in schools. Furthermore, in a study on the factors influencing academic success of refugee students in Canada, Wilkinson (2002) notes that lack of participation of refugee students in schools leads them to reject Canadian mainstream culture. This rejection of the mainstream culture reflects refugee students’ frustration and inability to cope with alien language of instruction.

In a landmark study into Somali Bantu refugee students in the United States, Roxas (2011) links inability in understanding and communicating in English, the
medium of instruction in the United States, to the disruptive behavior of Somali refugee students. The only way some of these refugee students could express themselves was through violence and insults. These students felt alienated and excluded. They were not able to take part in neither academic nor non-academic activities. Their self-esteem may have been diminished because they feel embarrassed to speak up in class. Refugee students are marginalized simply because the medium of instruction is alien to them. They are lost and frustrated. Language is a major deciding factor in the acculturation process of refugee students (Roxas, 2011).

A study into the literacy skills of refugee students conducted in Australia by Cranitch (2010) found that limited English proficiency was not only a barrier to their participation in the classroom but also in other activities such as sports, games, and drama. Furthermore, classroom observations of these refugee students indicated “difficulty staying seated, or on task, attention seeking behavior, inappropriate outbursts such as anger or weeping and complaints of physical symptoms” (Cranitch, 2010). The inability to stay engaged in learning activities is a reflection of the disconnect that is the result of a language barrier. According to a study done by Gibson and Carrasco (2009) refugee students who could not interact with other students and teachers because of a language barrier were most likely to experience difficulties in participating in sports and other recreational activities while in the classroom confusion, detachment and inability to concentrate were noted in these students.
2.5 Subject content and participation of refugee students

A number of conditions must be satisfied when designing and adopting any curriculum content. For example, the maturity levels of the intended recipients and their past experiences as well as any prerequisites are taken into account. In addition, the suitability and applicability of the content being taught must also be established. Content that is taught to refugee students should facilitate their participation in school activities and overall integration into the society. A study into refugee students in mainstream classes in Australia by Naidoo (2010) suggests that it is not only English language that inhibits students from interacting with local students but also knowing what to speak about. South Sudanese refugee students in mainstream classes were observed to interact less with local students particularly in math lessons. However in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes where content has been specifically designed for refugee students, they interacted with other refugee students and developed rapport with teachers (Naidoo, 2010).

In their study on refugee students in the United States, Gahungu, Gahungu and Luseono (2011) reported that Burundian refugee students in the United States found it difficult to participate in classroom activities because most of them had no prior schooling. Also, the fact that Burundi is a Francophone country did not help. These refugee students could not cope with the content as it was alien to them. Burundian refugee students were often observed to be isolated and withdrawn from the classroom activities.
According to a study conducted by Ferfolja and Vickers (2010) the Refugee Action Support (RAS) program has enabled refugee students in mainstream classes build confidence in raising and answering questions in class, delivering presentations and completing homework on time. The Refugee Action Support (RAS) provides qualified teachers as tutors to refugee students in mainstream classes in Australia. Findings by Ferfolja and Vickers (2010) also indicate that participation of refugee students in mainstream classes can be enhanced by the provision of after school tutors. Subject content such as math and the sciences are problematic for refugee students because many of them had their schooling interrupted or did not go to school prior to arriving in their host countries. The Refugee Action Support (RAS) advocates for content that facilitates peer collaboration, experiential learning and evaluating one’s own and others’ work so that classroom participation and inclusion are achieved. Furthermore, Dooley (2009) reports that content that builds on refugee students’ previous experiences are crucial for literacy across subjects and their participation in school activities.

2.6 Teaching methods and participation of refugee students

According to a study by Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, (2007), refugee students’ engagement in the classroom and school activities are influenced by the kind of instruction used in the classroom. Teaching strategies that promote interaction amongst students such as group discussions and competitions motivate students to speak up and collaborate on projects. Teachers who used the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model to teach refugee students saw
initiative and autonomy levels rise in their students. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model has been developed to cater for the academic needs of English learners in the United States. Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, (2007) assert that the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model promotes learning content as well as participation amongst students. The model incorporates activities such as group discussions into lessons allowing teachers and students to engage in these activities as lessons proceed.

In a study into refugee-serving schools in Kenya Dryden-Peterson (2015) found that refugee instruction was dominated by teacher centered methods especially the lecture method. The lecture method was observed as the dominant method of instruction in 46 of 53 classrooms in refugee serving schools in Kenya. Furthermore, student participation was reduced to question and answer sessions in which teachers asked factual questions to which students answered in chorus. Dryden-Peterson (2015) also reported that across 27 classroom observations in Kakuma refugee camp, there was only one instance of teachers facilitating conceptual learning. Teachers’ dominance of classroom time allows for a very limited opportunity for students to participate in the lessons. Additionally, in 53 classroom observations of refugee serving schools in Kenya, students asked questions in only 17 lessons and only in six lessons did the students ask more than one question (Dryden-Peterson, 2015).
2.7 Instructional resources and participation of refugee students

The availability or lack of instructional resources can impact the achievement of educational goals. Lyons (2012) states that learning is a complex undertaking which involves the interaction of students’ motivation, skills of teachers, teaching and learning materials, the curriculum and physical facilities. The availability of adequate and appropriate instructional resources therefore plays a crucial role in enhancing the effectiveness of learning. According to a study by Atieno (2014) instructional resources help in the attainment of educational outcomes since students are more likely to participate in educational activities that provide significant, stimulating and relevant experiences to them.

In a study on African refugee students Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005) report that English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms in Australia were short of materials and resources that were accessible to and appropriate for African refugee students. Teachers were unable to adapt mainstream texts and worksheets to suit African refugees. The lack of appropriate materials had uninspired refugee students and significantly reduced their enthusiasm and classroom participation (Miller, Mitchell, & Brown, 2005). Additionally, teachers complained about limited budgets for photocopying and ability to reproduce units, booklets and other support materials.

Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005) also noted that bilingual dictionaries significantly facilitated classroom discussions and word games once students
managed to use them. However, two obstacles cited were the limited number of bilingual dictionaries in Australian English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms and the lengthy periods it took to train the preliterate students on their usage. Refugee students from South Sudan who could read Arabic were observed to participate well in word games unlike their preliterate counterparts. This is because there were no Dinka-English dictionaries available in Australia.

In a study in Kenya, Dryden-Peterson (2015) observed that teachers in refugee-serving schools seldom had access to teaching resources other than the assigned textbook. Teachers made good use of the blackboard while students copied the notes onto their notebooks. This had tremendously reduced any opportunity for classroom interaction as the teacher used whatever remained of the 45 minute period to explain the lesson.

2.8 Summary of literature and research gap

Numerous global studies on school-based factors influencing participation of refugee students in secondary schools indicate that variables such as language of instruction, subject content, teaching methods and instructional resources impact on participation of refugee students in school activities. However, literature on participation of refugee students in schools in Kenya is very limited. Most studies on refugee education in Kenya focus on the issue of access and rarely delve into issues of quality (Mareng, 2010). A comprehensive study into refugee-serving schools in Kenya by Dryden-Peterson (2015) suggests that refugee students’
participation in school activities is greatly inhibited by lack of instructional resources, inappropriate teaching methods and lack of qualified and trained teachers. The study explores if there is influence of such school factors as language of instruction, subject content, teaching methods and instructional resources on the participation of refugee students. Additionally, the study operationalizes such variables as attendance, completion of homework on time and involvement in classroom discussion as a measure of participation of refugee students.

2.9 Theoretical framework

This study adopted the Instructional Theory proposed by Jerome Bruner (1966). Bruner based his instructional theory on the core premise that learning is an active process where the learner is placed center-stage. Instructional theory advocates for three principles: (a) instruction should relate to the experiences and contexts of students; (b) instruction must be organized in a spiral manner (from simple to complex, known to unknown); (c) instruction must facilitate extrapolation.

Based on this theory, the teacher’s role in the classroom is to build a learning environment that draws on the experiences and interests of the students. The teacher must play the role of a facilitator and allow students to “discover” knowledge. Content must be designed and organized in a manner that is relevant to the students’ maturity levels and cognition. Prior experiences and knowledge should provide an impetus for each successive learning activity. Also,
instructional resources such as textbooks, dictionaries, and audiovisual aids must be employed in a way that garners the students’ attention. The theory advocates for active learning in which students are immersed in the learning process.

This theory is appropriate for the study because of its implications on the teaching learning process in the classroom. The theory advocates for the active participation of students in the learning process. It also places importance on the prior knowledge and experiences of students in the learning process. The teacher is tasked with facilitating an active learning process to take place so that students may have meaningful and relevant learning experiences. This theory is therefore appropriate for the study as it sought to investigate the school-based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Kenya.

2.10 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework illustrates the four variables that influence participation of refugee students in secondary schools. They include language of instruction, subject content, teaching methods, and instructional resources. The process in the conceptual framework represents the teaching and learning process of refugee students while the outcome is the participation of refugee students in secondary schools. Figure 2.1 depicts the interplay between the independent variables and the dependent variable. It also shows the process whereby the
teaching and learning process takes place to facilitate the end result which is participation.

**Figure 2.1 Conceptual framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Subject content</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Instructional resources</th>
<th>Teaching-learning process</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Understanding</td>
<td>- Comprehension</td>
<td>- Lecture</td>
<td>- Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Classroom attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speaking</td>
<td>- Prior knowledge</td>
<td>- Group discussion</td>
<td>- Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participation in classroom discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of Difficulty</td>
<td>- Role play</td>
<td>- Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Completion of assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Classroom attendance
- Participation in classroom discussions
- Completion of assignments
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with how the study was carried out. It describes the research design, target population, sampling techniques and sample size, research instruments, validity and reliability of the research instruments, data collection techniques, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research design

This study adopted a mixed method research design. According to Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003), a mixed method research design combines both quantitative and qualitative research in an attempt to present a complex and holistic picture of the phenomenon of interest. This method was appropriate for the study because of the large number of respondents and the nature of information it gathered. The study sought to investigate school-based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Kenya.

3.3 Target population

The target population for this study consisted of the seven public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county. The target population included 7 principals, 98 teachers employed at the 7 public secondary schools and all 2,160 refugee students in the Kamukunji sub-county public secondary schools (Director of Education, Kamukunji sub-County, 2016).
3.4 Sample size and sampling procedures

According to Mugenda, O. and Mugenda, A. (2003) a sample refers to a small group drawn from the accessible population. Of the 7 schools, only 5 were sampled because the other two were used in the pilot for the study. Mugenda, O. and Mugenda, A. (2003) recommend drawing 10 to 30 percent of the target population if they exceed 1,000 people. Therefore, 15% of the target population was drawn for the refugee students. Purposive sampling was used for the refugee students based on the rationale that they would know the factors affecting their participation in school activities. Simple random sampling technique was used for the teachers.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee students</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 shows the sample size and the population from which it was drawn. The sampled 37 from a target population of 73 teachers representing 50 percent of the
teachers. The sample for refugee students amounted to 266 from a target population of 1,770 refugee students.

3.5 Research instruments

The study used questionnaires for refugee students and teachers as an instrument for data collection. Both instruments were designed by the researcher. Kabiru and Njenga (2009) state that questionnaires are ideal when a researcher intends to collect a large amount of data from a large number of respondents. The questionnaires had both open and closed ended items. The aim behind including open-ended items in the questionnaires was to gather as much information as possible and give respondents space to articulate their responses. The questionnaires were self-administered. Each questionnaire was divided into sections; the first section dealt with obtaining general information from the respondents while the other sections solicited information regarding the objectives of the study.

3.6 Validity of the instruments

Kabiru and Njenga (2009) define validity as the extent to which a test measures what it is intended to measure. Validity of the instruments was paramount for the creditability of the results it was to yield. Content validity of the instruments was judged by the supervisors. Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003) recommend the use of professionals or experts in the particular field to assess content validity of the instruments. Also, piloting of the questionnaires was done in two public
secondary schools in the sub-county. The two schools were randomly selected from the seven schools in the sub-county. Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003) recommend a piloting sample of 1 to 10 percent of the actual sample. The results from the two schools were used to establish feasibility and assess whether the items on the questionnaires convey the same meaning to all respondents and if they solicited the information they were intended to solicit.

3.7 Reliability of the instruments

Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003) define reliability as the extent to which a test or a measuring procedure yields consistent results or data on repeated trials. The reliability of the instruments was tested during the piloting of the questionnaires using the test-retest method. The questionnaires were administered in two public secondary schools at two different times. The reliability correlation co-efficient was calculated using Pearson’s product moment correlations formula. The formula is given as:

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

where;

\[ X = \text{scores from the first test} \]
\[ Y = \text{scores from the second test} \]
\[ N = \text{number of respondents} \]
A coefficient of 0.76 was calculated. Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003) state that a reliability coefficient above +0.6 is satisfactory for instrument reliability. The researcher accepted a reliability coefficient at +0.61.

3.8 Data collection procedures

The researcher obtained a research permission letter first from the Department and then from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Upon securing the research permission, the researcher presented it to the Kamukunji sub-County Director of Education (DoE) and all the head teachers of the secondary schools earmarked for data collection. The researcher followed up by making scheduled visits to the schools to collect data. On the agreed dates, the researcher administered the research instruments to the respondents after having explained the purpose of the study to them.

3.9 Data analysis techniques

After collecting data, the researcher checked through the returned questionnaires for errors such as spelling mistakes and black spaces. Data were then coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used as well as inferential statistics such as Pearson’s correlation to establish the influence of school-based factors on participation of refugee students. The data were presented in tabular form. Open-ended items were organized thematically and presented in a narrative form. In the analyses of Pearson correlation, p value of 0.05 was used as
the cutoff for significance. If the p-value was less than 0.05, then a significant relationship was reported between the dependent and independent variable.

3.10 Ethical considerations

Due to the sensitivity of the topic of urban refugees and its related issues of legal residence, the study was conducted under strict adherence to ethical guidelines governing social research. Questionnaires were self-administered and did not solicit personal information or identity. Confidentiality and anonymity were upheld. Respondents were asked not to reveal any personal information and told that they were free to stop if they felt uncomfortable.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analyzed data and its interpretation. The chapter also presents extensive discussions on research findings regarding research objectives. The study objectives were: to determine the influence of language of instruction; subject content; teaching methods and instructional resources on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamakunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. Data were collected from five public secondary schools in Kamakunji sub-country, Nairobi. The chapter begins with questionnaire return rate followed by demographic information and findings from the research questions based on the study objectives.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate

Two sets of questionnaires were used to collect data for this study; one for teachers and the other for refugee students. Data obtained from these two sets of questionnaires were included in the data analysis. Data is presented in Table 4.1
Table 4.1

Questionnaire return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee students</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaires were administered in person to the teachers and students where twenty eight teachers out of 37 teachers returned the questionnaires which accounted to 76.0% and 230 (86%) out of 266 refugee students. The average return rate was 85.0%. The response rate was adequate based on the recommendations of Mugenda, A. and Mugenda, O. (2003) who suggest that a response rate at and over 70 percent is adequate for analysis.

4.3 Demographic and background information

The study sought to determine the background information of both teachers and refugee students. This background information of key respondents was imperative to confirm whether the research reached the targeted audience and whether or not the research captured the information it effectively sought. For the teachers, gender, highest level of qualification and duration on the teaching experience. The refugee students were asked to indicate their gender and year of study.
4.3.1 Gender of teachers

Gender, as a factor, was considered in order to gather information from both genders. Table 4.2 illustrates the gender distribution of teachers sampled in the study.

Table 4.2

Distribution of teachers by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Table 4.2 among the teachers, most of teachers accounting to (67.9%) were male while (32.1%) were female teachers. This data may point to gender inequality in the teaching sector. The results may also allude to gender imbalance in the hiring of teachers in the public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county.

4.3.2 Academic qualification of teachers

The study sought to establish academic qualifications of teachers in order to assess their teaching and training credentials. The academic qualifications of teachers were categorized as Diploma, Bachelor of Education (B. Ed), Masters in
Education (M. Ed) and PhD. The distribution of teachers by academic qualification is presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Distribution of teachers by highest academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates that majority of the teachers 67.9% who participated in the study had a bachelor’s degree in education which implies that most teachers possess minimum qualification which is diploma in education and so they are presumably qualified and hence they are capable of performing their duties as expected. These findings are consistent with those of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST, 2005) which noted that teachers’ employment was not based on performance but on qualification. The data contradicts previous findings by Dryden-Peterson (2015) which suggests that teachers teaching refugee students in public secondary schools in Kenya were mostly unqualified. However, it is pertinent to mention that Dryden-Peterson (2015) had conducted her study in Kakuma refugee camp and not in an urban setting such as Nairobi.
4.3.3 Teachers’ years of experience

The study sought to find out teachers’ experience in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county in order to assess percentage of teachers who have adequate experience to function effectively in their work. This is significant because skills are nurtured and perfected through practice; therefore, teachers’ work experience is an important indicator of quality in dispensing teaching duties. Table 4.4 shows years of experience of teachers.

Table 4.4

Distribution of teachers by years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that out of the 28 teachers who participated in the study, 17 (60.7%) said they had a teaching experience of 1 to 5 years and 11 (39.3%) teachers indicated that they had a teaching experience of 6-10 years. This depicts that most of the teachers who participated in the study possess requisite experience and so they can be relied upon in the study to contribute to the findings since teachers’ work experience is an important indicator of quality in dispensing teaching duties.
4.3.4 Gender of refugee students

The study also sought to determine the gender of refugee students who took part in the study. This information was provided by the refugee students. This was done to gather information from both genders in order to understand about rate of retention in the study area. Table 4.5 illustrates the distribution of refugee students by gender.

Table 4.5

Distribution of refugee students by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 illustrates that out of the 230 refugee students who participated in the study, 176 were males representing a percentage of 76.5 percent. Female refugee students accounted for 54 representing a percentage of 23.5 percent. Table 4.8 clearly indicates that male refugee students outnumber females in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county. The issues of gender imbalance of urban refugees are mostly contributed to early marriages of school girls (UNHCR, 2012).
4.3.5 Year of study of refugee students

The study also sought to determine the year of study of refugee students. This information was important in order to understand the trend of retention and enrollment of refugee students. This information was provided by refugee students in the study area. Table 4.6 presents the distribution of refugee students by year of study.

Table 4.6

Distribution of refugee students by year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of study</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that a majority of the refugee students (39.6 %) were in their third year of study, with the second largest number (37.8%) being in their fourth year. The least number of refugee students (1.3%) were in their first year of study. The findings imply that most refugee students in urban areas have declined over the years due to resettlement in western countries (UNHCR, 2016).
4.4 Participation of refugee students

Participation of refugee students in the school was measured using three variables, classroom attendance, completion of homework and involvement in classroom discussions. The findings on extent of participation of refugee students in public secondary schools are as shown in the section.

4.4.1 Number of refugee students per class

The study sought to establish whether teachers actually interacted with refugee students in class or not. Therefore, teachers were asked whether they had refugee students in their classrooms. Table 4.7 shows that all teachers who participated in the study had refugee students in their classes.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below 20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 indicates that out of the 28 teachers, 16 (57.1%) had less than 20 refugee students in their class. The remaining 12 teachers indicated that they had between 20 to 30 refugee students in their class representing 42.9 percent. This
means that teachers were actually in contact with refugee students and were in a position to provide information regarding their participation in school.

4.4.2 Classroom attendance by refugee students

Teachers were asked whether refugee students attended their classes on a regular basis. Table 4.8 below shows class attendance of refugee students as reported by their teachers.

Table 4.8
Classroom attendance by refugee students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 shows the classroom attendance of refugee students as noted by their teachers. Teachers were split down the middle in their responses, 50 percent said that refugee students attended their classes regularly while the other half said they did not.

4.4.3 Variation in class attendance between refugee and native students

The study also sought to find out whether there was a variation in classroom attendance between refugee students and regular students. The findings are as shown in Table 4.9
Table 4.9
Variation in class attendance between refugee and regular students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9, depicts the responses given by the teachers. An overwhelming majority, 89 percent said that there was a variation in classroom attendance between refugee and regular students. The main reason teachers gave for this variation was that refugee students were usually away on resettlement interviews with the United Nations. The findings agree with Nthiga (2013) who observed low classroom attendance of refugee students in Eastleigh North Division. She attributed this low classroom attendance to constant interviews with the United Nations and Western Embassies for resettlement purposes.

4.4.4 Participation of refugee students in classroom discussions
Also, as part of measuring classroom and school participation of refugee students, teachers were asked whether refugee students participated in classroom discussions. Participation in classroom discussions is an essential feature of active learning. It shows that students take part in and are also involved in the learning
process. It is a good measure of participation. Table 4.10 presents teachers’ responses.

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of refugee students in classroom discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 illustrates the responses teachers gave as to whether or not refugee students participated in classroom discussions. The data shows that 60.7 percent of teachers said that refugee students participated in classroom discussions while 39.3 percent said they didn’t. According to Ferfolja and Vickers (2010), involvement in classroom discussions is a good indicator of participation of students. The findings imply that refugee students participated in classroom activities.

**4.4.5 Completion of assignments by refugee students**

As a measure of participation in classroom and school activities, completion of assignments by refugee students was taken into account. Completion of assignments is a good indicator of participation of students in school activities. Teachers were asked whether refugee students complete assignments on time and if not what could be the reasons. Table 4.11 presents their responses.
Table 4.1

Completion of assignments by refugee students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows the responses of the teachers as to whether refugee students completed assignments on time. The data shows that 42.9 percent of the teachers stated that refugee students did complete assignments on time. However, 57.1 percent said that refugee students did not complete assignments on time. The findings imply that most refugee students could not complete assignments and hence their participation in classroom activities may have been hindered. Completion of assignments and tasks is a good a measure of ascertaining classroom participation.

4.4.6 Rate of Participation

Participation of refugee students in secondary schools was measured by classroom attendance, participation in classroom discussions and completion of assignments using 3 level Likert scale where by high participation was coded as 2-3, average participation was coded as 2 while low participation was coded as below 2. The findings are as shown in Table 4.12
Table 4.12

Participation of refugee students in classroom discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Scale</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.12 show the level of participation of students was average in both class attendance and class discussions but lowest in completion of assignments. This means that refugee students attended classes regularly and took part in classroom discussions as well. However, they faced difficulties completing assignments on time and this indicates decreased participation levels.

4.4.7 Overall Participation of refugee students in classroom discussions

The researcher sought to establish overall participation of all refugee students in schools by aggregating three variables; classroom attendance, participation in classroom discussions and completion of assignments and finding out the frequency of participation. The findings are as shown in Table 4.13.
The findings Table 4.13 shows that on average the participation of refugees students in the study area was low (42.9%) followed by (35.7%) of refugees students whose participation was found to be average while only 21.4% refugees students were rated to have high participation. Student participation in school marks an internal drive towards learning, engaging in social activities, working with peers, and a healthy sense of belonging. This leads to a strong desire to excel academically. Since student participation can be linked to the long term success of students, it must be considered as an important component of school objectives (Goodenow, 1993).

### 4.5 Influence of language of instruction on participation of refugee students

To determine whether the language of instruction influenced participation of refugee students in school, teachers and refugee students were asked a number of questions including rating of refugee students’ understanding of the English
language, students’ communication problems, and if the language of instruction was a barrier to participation in school.

4.5.1 Refugee students’ understanding of English

Refugee students and their teachers were asked to rate refugee students’ understanding of the English language. This was done to establish whether refugee students had a grasp on English which is the language of instruction in Kenya. Their responses are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Rating of refugee students’ understanding of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that 50 percent of the teachers rated refugee students’ understanding of English as being average while 32.1 percent rated them as poor in English. The study also shows that only 5 teachers (17.9%) rated refugee students as good in English while none rated them as excellent. When it comes to refugee students rating their own understanding of English, 77 (33.5%) of them said they were excellent in English, 92 (40%) of refugee students rated
themselves as being good in English while 57 (24.8%) rated themselves as average.

The data presented in Table 4.14 and 4.15 show bias on part of the refugee students. Kaminska and Foulsham (2013) indicate that the main reason why respondents give unlikely responses is to avoid embarrassment and to make themselves look better. Kaminska and Foulsham (2013) go on to explain that respondents are not comfortable revealing unpleasant behavior or answering in a way that may cast a negative light on them. This implies that refugee students did not want to disclose that they were poor in English.

4.5.2 Communication difficulties between teachers and refugee students

Refugee students and their teachers were asked if they experienced difficulties in communication because of the language of instruction. Table 4.15 presents their responses.

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 clearly shows that there is a discrepancy on how refugee students and their teachers responded to whether they had communication difficulties. Teachers, 85.7 percent of them said they had communication problems with their refugee students while only 22.6 percent of the refugee students admitted to having communication problems. Findings of MacNevin (2012) agree with the opinion of the teachers that due to constant breakdowns in communication between refugee students and their teachers, participation of refugee students in classroom and school activities were curtailed.

**4.5.3 Language of instruction as a barrier to participation**

The language of instruction can form a barrier to students who want to participate in class. Therefore, the study sought to find out whether the language of instruction was a barrier to their participation in school. The study sought responses from both teachers and refugee students. Table 4.16 illustrates their responses.

**Table 4.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of instruction as a barrier to participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the refugee students (77 %) stated that the language of instruction was not a barrier to their participation in school. Only 23.0 percent acknowledged that the language of instruction was indeed a barrier to their participation in school.

However, a majority of the teachers, (78.6) % percent, said that the language of instruction was a barrier to the participation of refugee students in classroom and school activities. Responses from refugee students are biased because they want to present a good picture of themselves. They feel either embarrassed or ashamed to admit that the language of instruction is a barrier to their participation in school. Teachers however were realistic in their responses.

Table 4.16 data is in line with the fact that a large number of refugee students rated their English language skills as being excellent (33.5%) and good (40%). Also, a majority of refugee students stated that they had no communication problems, 77.4 percent, which leads us to deduce that the language of instruction would not be a barrier to their participation in school. This finding does not agree with Wilkinson (2002) and Roxas (2011) who observed that due to the limited English proficiency of refugee students, the language of instruction was a barrier to their participation in Canada and USA. However their findings agree with that of the teachers.
4.6 Subject content and participation of refugee students

As part of this study refugee students and their teachers were asked if learning some subjects was harder to learn than others and the possible reasons for that. This was done to establish whether subject content influences participation of refugee students in public schools. Also, refugee students were asked if this difficulty was a barrier to their participation in school. They were also asked if refugee students participated in classroom discussions. Finally, teachers and refugee students were asked to rate the adequacy of subject content, difficulty of subject content and refugee students’ prior knowledge in terms of their significance to participation in school.

4.6.1 Difficulty of some subjects and its hindrance to participation

In order to gauge the influence of subject content on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, refugee students and their teachers were asked whether learning some subjects was harder than others and if so whether this difficulty hindered their participation in school. Tables 4.17 and 4.18 depict their responses.
Table 4.17

Difficulty in learning some subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 shows that on the one hand 47.0 percent of refugee students said that learning some subjects was harder than others. This was probably because refugee students lacked the essential basic skills in these some subjects.

Table 4.18

Hindrance to participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows the responses of refugee students to whether difficulty in learning some subjects was a hindrance to their participation in school. As the data shows, 33.5 percent of refugee students said that difficulty learning some
subjects was a hindrance to their participation in school. At the same time 66.5 percent of refugee students said that difficulty in learning some subjects was not a barrier to their participation in school. This implies that subject content influences participation of refugee students in public secondary schools.

Naidoo (2010) observed that it is not only the language of instruction which may inhibit participation of refugee students in school activities but also knowing what to speak about. That is, certain subjects may be more difficult to learn than others. As evident in the data gathered here, refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukumji sub-county found learning mathematics and chemistry harder than others and 33.5 percent of them said this difficulty inhibited their participation in school.

4.6.2 Subject content and prior knowledge of refugee students and their participation

In order to assess whether adequacy of subject content, difficulty of subject content and refugee students’ prior knowledge had influence on participation, refugee students and teachers were asked to rate adequacy of subject content, difficulty of subject content and prior knowledge using a 5 level Likert scale where; Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1. The findings are shown in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19

Teachers’ responses on the significance of adequacy and difficulty of subject and prior knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Factor</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of subject content</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of subject content</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=28

Table 4.19 shows that overall most teachers agreed that the adequacy of subject was significant for refugee student participation (M=3.5; SD=0.79) which is a small standard deviation meaning that the values in a statistical data set are close to the mean of the data set, indicating that indicating that adequacy of subject was very significant. The results show that a majority of the teachers thought adequacy of subject was important for student participation in class which means it was fairly significant as shown by (M=3.00; SD =1.222) where a large standard deviation meaning that scores were far apart to the mean due to variation. When it comes to difficulty of
subject content, the mean was fairly significant with (M=3.143; SD=0.803). In terms of prior knowledge, 57.1 percent of the teachers said it was fairly significant with 25 percent indicating it was significant to participation of refugee students.

**Table 4.20**

**Teachers’ responses on the significance of subject content and participation of refugee students**

To assess the influence of subject content on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.20. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient r measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the p value measure <0.05 measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of r is always between +1 and −1. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of r, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).
Correlation results show a positive correlation ($r=0.54$, $p<0.05$) which indicates that subject content moderately influenced refugee student participation in class. The findings are in agreement with Naidoo (2010) who found that subject content influences participation of refugee students in school. The findings imply that appropriateness and level of difficulty of subject content can predict participation of refugee students in school. The findings agree with Gahungu, Gahungu and Luseno (2011) who reported that subject content was significant to the participation of Burundian refugee students in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject content</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject content</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of Refugee students</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>>Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (t-tailed)
Table 4.21

Refugee students’ responses on the significance of adequacy and difficulty of subject and prior knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Fact or</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of subject content</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of subject content</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=230

Table 4.21 shows that most of refugee students said adequacy of subject content was very significant to their participation (M=3.904; SD=0.903), small standard deviation meaning that the values in a statistical data set are close to the mean of the data set. The results show that a majority of the refugee students thought adequacy of subject was important for student participation in class. Furthermore, most of refugees students indicated that difficulty of subject content was significant to their participation (M= 3.542; SD=1.082) which show the respondent varied, similarly most of refugees students stated that prior knowledge was fairly significant to their participation in school as (M= 2.59; SD= 1.02).
Table 4.22 Correlations on Refugees’ responses on the significance of subject content and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of subject content on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.22. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient $r$ measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the $p$ value measure <0.05 measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of $r$ is always between +1 and −1. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of $r$, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject content</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject content</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of Refugee students</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>>Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (t-tailed)
The result from Table 4.22 shows a strong relationship between subject content and participation of refugee students at a correlation (r=59, p<0.05). This means that 59.0% of subject content influence strongly and positively to refugees students participation in the class. The findings concur with Dooley (2009) who reported that content which is appropriate to refugee students’ level and builds on their previous experiences is crucial for literacy across subjects and their participation in school activities.

4.7 Teaching methods and participation of refugee students in school

In order to investigate school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya, the study sought to determine the influence of teaching methods on participation of refugee students. Lyons (2012) stated that learning is a complex undertaking in which the skills of a teacher and how those skills are used are a central ingredient. Teaching methods therefore are crucial to the participation of students in classroom activities.

4.7.1 Presentations in the classroom

As part of assessing whether or not teaching methods influence participation of refugee students in school, refugee students were asked if their teachers assign them projects to present in class. Their responses are shown in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23

Presentations in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 shows that an overwhelming majority of refugee students, 180 out of 230, that is 78.3 percent of them said that they were assigned projects to present in class. Only 50 refugee students out of the 230 who participated in the study indicated that they were not assigned projects to present in class. The results imply that refugee students take an active part in the learning process. This means that participatory learning processes take place and refugee students are the center point of these learning processes.

Table 4.24: Correlations on classroom presentation and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of classroom presentation on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.22. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient r measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the p value measure <0.05 measures the probability of value of less than 0.05(chance of less than 5 times in a
hundred for it to be significant. The value of r is always between +1 and −1. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of r, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).0-.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Presentation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Presentation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>N 230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Refugee students</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values obtained on the independent variable (class room presentation) were correlated with the dependent variable (participation in class). Correlation results show a moderate correlation of (r=0.57; p<0.05), which indicates that classroom presentation influenced refugee student participation in class. The findings above are in line with Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, (2007), who stated that refugee student’ engagement and involvement in classroom activities influence their participation in school activities.
4.7.2 Influence of different teaching methods on participation of refugee students in school

The study sought to assess the influence of the lecture method, group discussion and role playing on participation of refugee students in school. Teachers and refugee students were asked to rate the above mentioned categories of teaching methods in terms of their significance to participation of refugee students. Table 4.25 presents their responses.

Table 4.25

Teachers’ responses on the significance of the lecture method, group discussion and role playing to the participation of refugee students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Factor</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture method</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=28

Table 4.25 shows that most teachers strongly agreed that the lecture method was significant for refugee student participation (M=3.571; SD= 0.79) which was small indicating percent indicating that responses in a statistical data set were close to the mean of the data set, indicating that indicating that adequacy
of subject was very significant (M=3.00; SD=1.122). On role playing most teachers could neither agree nor disagree that the method was significant to participation of refugee students (M=3.143; SD=0.803). The results do not concur with Dryden-Peterson (2015) who reported that majority of teachers in refugee serving-schools in Kakuma and Dadaab refugee camps used the lector method to teach which inhibited refugee students’ participation in school.

Table 4.26 Correlations on teaching methods and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of teaching methods on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.26. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient r measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the p value measure <0.05 measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of r is always between +1 and −1. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of r, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).0-.19).
Correlation results on Table 4.26 show a correlation of \((r=0.52; \ p<0.05)\) which indicates that teaching methods moderately influenced refugee student participation in class. This finding indicates that participation of refugee students can be predicted by the type of teaching method used to teach them. The findings concur with Dooley (2009) who reported that teaching methods which place the learner in the center of the learning process encourage participation and foster engagement in the learning process. The findings also indicate that teachers should use varying teaching methods in order to captivate the interest of refugee students. Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2007) suggest that teaching strategies which promote interaction amongst students such as group discussions and competition games are important for participation in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of Refugees Students</th>
<th>Participation of Refugees Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.27

Refugee students’ responses on the significance of the lecture method, group discussion and role playing to their participation in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Factor</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture method</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=230

Table 4.27 shows that most refugee students said that the lecture method was significant for refugee student participation in class (M=3.02;SD=0.49), meaning that the responses were similar across the cohort. Similarly, most refugees could neither agree nor disagree that group discussion was significant for improving students’ participation as shown by a (M=2.76; SD=1.19). On role playing, most refugees said it was very significant to their participation in school activities as shown by (M=3.273; SD=0.73). The results show that a majority of the student refugees thought lecture method was important for student participation in class.
Table 4.28

Correlations on teaching methods and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of teaching methods on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.28. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient $r$ measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the $p$ value measure $<0.05$ measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of $r$ is always between +1 and −1.

Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of $r$, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).0-.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Participation of Refugee students</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values obtained on the independent variable (lecture method) were strongly correlated with the dependent variable (participation in class). Correlation results show a correlation of \( r=0.54, p>0.05 \) which indicates that instruction method influenced refugee student participation in class. The result shows a slightly higher but similar correlation to that in Table 4.26.

### 4.8 Instructional resources and participation of refugee students in school

To determine whether instructional resources had any bearing on the participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. Both teachers and refugee students were asked to rate textbooks, dictionaries and wall charts in terms of their significance to participation in school. Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005) reported that appropriate instructional resources were particularly important for refugee students because they significantly facilitated classroom discussions and word games which in turn contributed to their participation in school. Table 4.29 presents teachers’ responses on the significance of instructional resources to the participation of refugee students.
Table 4.29

Teachers’ responses on the significance of instructional resources on the participation of refugee students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/ Factor</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.331</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall charts</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=28

Table 4.29 shows that most of teachers said that textbooks as part of instructional materials were significant for refugee student participation in class (M=3.331; SD=0.65). Similarly most students indicated that dictionaries were significant together with wall charts though they said they were fairly significant to the participation of refugee students in the classroom (M=3.09 SD=1.24). The results show that a majority of the teachers thought instructional resources were significant for student participation in class (M=4.21; SD=0.94). The findings agree with Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005) who observed increased participation of refugee students in ESL classroom in Australia as a result of the availability of bilingual dictionaries in the classrooms.
Table 4.30

Correlations on instructional resources and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of instructional resources on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.30. In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient \( r \) measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the \( p \) value measure \(<0.05\) measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of \( r \) is always between +1 and −1. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of \( r \), the ranges are as followed, (very weak \(0-.19\)), (\(0.20-.39\) weak), moderate (\(0.40-.59\)), strong (\(0.60-.79\)), very strong (\(0.80-.1.00\)).0-.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Resources</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of Refugee students</th>
<th>Sig. (2 tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Correlation results show a correlation of \( r=0.61, p<0.05 \) which indicates that instructional resources strongly influenced refugee student participation in class. The findings imply that the availability of appropriate instructional resources influences participation of refugee students in school. The findings agree with Dryden-Peterson (2015) who suggests that instructional resources such as textbooks and dictionaries have the potential to facilitate classroom discussion and encourage participation.

**Table 4.31**

Refugee students’ responses on the significance of textbooks, dictionaries and wall charts to the participation of refugee students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Factor</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall charts</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=230

Table 4.31 shows that most of refugee students said that textbooks were very significant for their participation in class \((M=3.571; \ SD=0.79)\) which show that the responses clustered around the mean indicating that textbooks were significant. On the significance of dictionaries, most respondents indicated that they were significant \((M=3.00; \ SD=1.122)\) The results are similar to those in Table 4.30 which indicate that instructional resources are significant to the participation of refugee students in school \((M=3.143; \ SD=0.803)\).
Table 4.32
Correlations on instructional resources and participation of refugee students

To assess the influence of instructional resources on participation of refugee students in school, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used and the findings presented in the responses are contained in Table 4.32 In statistics, the Pearson correlation coefficient $r$ measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables while the $p$ value measure $<0.05$ measures the probability of value of less than 0.05 (chance of less than 5 times in a hundred for it to be significant. The value of $r$ is always between $-1$ and $1$. Interpreting correlation was based on (Evans, 1996), where by the ranges in correlation is interpreted depending on strength of $r$, the ranges are as followed, (very weak 0-.19), (20-.39 weak), moderate (.40-.59), strong (.60-.79), very strong (.80-1.00).0-.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Resources</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of Refugee students</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results on Table 4.32 show a strong positive relationship between instructional resources and participation of refugee students. The relationship is at a correlation coefficient of \( r=0.63, \ p<0.05 \). Again, the findings agree with Miller, Mitchell and Brown (2005) who observed increased levels of participation of refugee students in Australia as a result of availability of appropriate instructional resources. The findings imply that participation of refugee students in public schools in Kenya can be facilitated by the availability of adequate and appropriate instructional resources such textbooks, dictionaries and wall charts.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on the summary, conclusion and recommendations based on the findings of the study. This study sought to investigate the school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya.

5.2 Summary of the study
The purpose for which the study was to investigate the school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. The study was guided by four objectives which were to determine the influence of language of instruction; subject content; teaching methods and instructional resources on participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamakunji sub-county, Nairobi. The study employed a descriptive survey design to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The target population for the study included all seven public secondary schools in the sub-county. Two schools were later randomly selected for piloting. The subsequent sample was drawn from the other five schools. The sample consisted of 266 refugee students, who were purposively sampled, and 37 teachers who were randomly sampled. Questionnaires were used for data collection for both refugee students and teachers. Both sets of questionnaires had
open and closed-ended items. Both inferential and descriptive statistics were used for the analysis of data and results presented in tabular and narrative forms. Based on the analysis of the research questions in this study, the following findings were established.

The findings on the influence of the language of instruction indicate varied responses between teachers and refugee students. For example, 50 percent of the teachers rated refugee students’ English as being average while only 17.9 percent of them rated them as good. On the other hand, 33.5 percent of refugee students said they were excellent in English. When asked if the language of instruction was a barrier to the participation of refugee students, 78.6 percent of the teachers said it was a barrier while 77.0 percent of refugee students said it wasn’t. The findings of the study indicate that the language of instruction influences participation of refugee students in public secondary schools.

Majority of the teachers, 89.3 percent of the teachers said that refugee students had difficulties learning some subjects. Also most teachers agreed that the adequacy of subject was significant for refugee student participation as shown by a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.79. The findings also show that a majority of the teachers thought difficulty of subject content was important to student participation with a mean of 3.00. Subject content was found to have influence on participation of refugee students with a Pearson’s correlation of 0.54.

Findings on the influence of teaching methods and participation of refugee students revealed that 78.3 percent of refugee said that they were given projects to
present in class. This implies that most teachers were using active learning strategies such as class presentations. The study also found a correlation of 0.57 between classroom presentation and participation of refugee students. This means classroom presentations contributed to increased levels of student participation. The study also found that the lecture method was significant for refugee student participation with a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.79. Teaching methods were found to influence participation of refugee students with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.58.

The study found that teachers thought, as part of instructional resources, textbooks were significant for refugee student participation in class as shown by a mean of 3.331 and standard deviation of 0.65. Refugee students also said that textbooks were very significant to their participation in school with a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.79. Instructional resources were found to have an influence on participation of refugee students in school with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.63.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the research findings, the study concluded that language of instruction influenced the participation of refugee students in public secondary schools. Majority of the respondents felt that difficulties and problems in communication between refugee students and their teachers hindered the participation of refugee students in school. Despite most of refugee students reporting their English proficiency as good and excellent, their teachers stated that they were average and
poor. The study concluded that language of instruction was indeed a barrier to the participation of refugee students in public secondary schools in Kamukunji Sub-county, Kenya.

The study concluded that subject content influenced participation of refugee students in school. Adequacy and difficulty of subject as well as prior knowledge of students were important to the participation of refugee students. The study also concluded that teaching methods such as role playing, group discussion and lecture method were all important in influencing participation of refugee students. Finally, the study concluded that instructional resources influenced participation of refugee students.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Schools serving a large number of refugee students should initiate after-school tutoring programs targeting refugee students. These tutoring sessions should focus on subjects such as maths, chemistry and English language.

2. Those schools serving a large number of refugee students incorporate various teaching methods such as group discussion and role playing to facilitate active learning.

3. The school management should make available to refugee students bilingual dictionaries such as English-Somali dictionaries along with an ample number of textbooks and wall charts.
5.5 Suggestions for further research

This study investigated school based factors influencing participation of refugee students in public secondary schools. More research needs to be done on the following areas:

1. The influence of instructional resources on participation of refugee students in public schools.

2. Replication of this study elsewhere.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi
School of Education
P.O. Box 30197
Nairobi

The Head Teacher

Dear Sir/Madame

REF: PERMISSION TO COLLECT DATA IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a Master of Education student at the University of Nairobi specializing in
Curriculum Studies. I am conducting a research project on School Based Factors
Influencing Participation of Refugee students in Public Secondary Schools in
Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. I would kindly request your assistance
and cooperation in collecting accurate data. Ethical considerations including
confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained to the highest standards. The
information you provided will be used for research purposes only.

Yours faithfully,

Abdirisaq Mukhtar Yousuf
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APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is designed to gather data on School Based Factors Influencing Participation of Refugee Students in Public Secondary Schools in Kamukunji Sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. You are kindly requested to tick (✓) the appropriate response and provide your answers in the provided spaces.

Section A: Demographic information

1. What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )
2. What is your highest academic qualification?
   PhD ( ) M.Ed ( ) B.Ed ( ) Diploma ( )
3. For how long have you been a class teacher in this school?
   1-5 years ( ) 6-10 years ( ) above 10 years ( )
4. Do you have refugee students in your class? Yes ( ) No ( )
5. What is the average number of refugee students in your class?
   Below 20 ( ) 20-30 ( ) more than 30 ( )
6. Do refugee students attend your classes regularly?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   6.(A) Is there a variation between the attendance of refugee and native students?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   6.(B) Please explain your answer…………………………………………………

Section B: Language of instruction and participation of refugee students

7. How do you rate refugee students’ understanding of English?
   Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Average ( ) Poor ( )
8. (A). Do you experience communication problems with refugee students as a result of the language of instruction?  Yes ( )  No ( )

8. (B). Please explain your answer………………………………………………

9. Is the language of instruction a barrier to the participation of refugee students in the school?  Yes ( )  No ( )

9.(A). Please explain your answer………………………………………………

Section C: Subject content and participation of refugee students

10. Do refugee students have difficulties learning your subject?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

11. Are they able to complete homework assignments on time?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

12. Do they take participate in classroom discussions during your class?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

10.(A). Please explain your answer………………………………………………

13. Please rate the following categories in terms of their significance to participation of refugee students. Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Fairly Significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of subject content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of subject content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Teaching methods and participation of refugee students

14. Rate the following teaching methods with No. 1 as the most frequently used and No. 5 as the least used. Please also indicate how it contributes to participation of refugee students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>How does it contribute to participation of refugee students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Instructional resources and participation of refugee students

15. Rate the following instructional resources in terms of their significance to participation of refugee students. Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Fairly significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REFUGEE STUDENTS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data on School Based Factors Influencing Participation of Refugee Students in Public Secondary Schools in Kamukunji sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya. Please tick (✓) the appropriate response or by writing your response in the provided spaces. Do not write your name or the name of your school anywhere. Your responses will be accorded great confidentiality and will only be used for the purposes of this research.

Section A: Demographic information

1. What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Which class are you in?
   Form I ( ) Form II ( ) Form III ( ) Form IV ( )

Section B: Language of instruction and participation of refugee students

3. How do you rate your English language skills?
   Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor ( )
   3.(A). Do you experience difficulties understanding teachers’ instructions?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   3.(B). Please explain your answer…………………………………………………………

4. Do you have difficulties raising or answering a question in class?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   4.(A). Please explain……………………………………………………………………

   4.(B). Is the language of instruction a barrier to your participation in school?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   4.(C) Please explain……………………………………………………………………

Section C: Subject content and participation of refugee students

5. Do you find learning some subjects harder than others?
6. Please explain........................................................................................................
7. Does this difficulty hinder your participation in school?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
8. Please explain....................................................................................................
9. Do you think the subject content being taught to you is appropriate for you?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
10. Please explain....................................................................................................
11. Do you think specially designed subject content would contribute to your participation in school?  
    Yes ( )  No ( )
12. Please explain....................................................................................................
13. Rate the following categories in terms of their importance to your participation in school. Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Fairly Significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Teaching methods and participation of refugee students

14. Do your teachers involve you in the teaching and learning process?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
15. Please explain............................................................................................
16. Do your teachers assign you projects to present in class?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
17. Do your teachers allow you to raise questions and/or make comments in class?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

18. Rate the following teaching methods in terms of their significance to your participation in the classroom. Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching method</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Fairly Significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Instructional resources and participation of refugee students

19. Do you think teaching and learning materials (TLM) influence your participation in school?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

20. Please explain........................................................................................................

21. Please rate the following instructional resources in terms of their significance to your participation in the classroom. Very significant=5, significant=4, fairly significant=3, insignificant=2, not applicable=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Fairly significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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