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ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate the socio-economic factors’ influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives; to determine the influence of parental level of education on internal efficiency in the provision of education, to establish the effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education, to examine influence of parental income levels on internal efficiency in the provision of education and to establish the influence of pupils’ engagement in household duties on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools. The study employed a descriptive survey research design and 86 public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, 86 head teachers, 1008 teachers, 3336 standard eight pupils. The responses from the 26 head teachers interviewed, 75 teachers and 260 pupils filling of questionnaires were insightful and elaborated issues in the literature reviewed. The results from the field highlighted the following points; schools’ internal efficiency is influenced by the learning during learners’ school age attendance compared to the resources provided. The percentage of the pupils completing school is often used as (its) measure. Internal efficiency of an education system is revealed by the promotion, repetition and dropout rates. The study findings indicated that parents’ level of income was low due to the fact that majority of the pupils parents were unemployed. Majority of the teachers indicated that low parental levels of education causes pupils drop out due to the negative attitudes hence pupils’ low academic progress either, leads to repetition or drop out which affects the completion rates. Family structure has been found to be a major factor that influences inefficiency in schools because children from single parent household are mainly poor hence unable to pay fees. It was found that household duties affects internal efficiency because pupils are forced to be out of school to attend to household duties and lack concentration due to fatigue associated to household chores. The poverty in the area should be addressed by the community with the assistance of the government for the parents to have reliable sources of income to economically support their children in school.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

According to Eamon (2005) economic hardship are caused by low socioeconomic status of the parents and can lead to disruption in parenting, increased amount of family conflicts and likelihood of depression in single parent households. Socio-economic status, indicate the quality of home life for children.

According to Levin (2001) the notion of efficiency cannot be overlooked in education. It is an idea that presupposes a transformation of some kind. One can think in terms of what was in hand before the transformation, what was in hand after the transformation, and one can also think about the transformation process itself. The elements that come before a process are commonly referred to as ingredients, inputs, or resources while those that come after a process are called results, outputs, or outcomes. Efficiency is about inputting the minimum before elements so as to produce the maximum results at the least cost.

Internal efficiency in education is defined as “the amount of learning achieved during school age attendance, compared to the resources provided, the percentage of entering students who complete the course is often used as (its) measure” (Okantey, 2008). Internal efficiency of an education system is revealed by the promotion, repetition and drop-out rates. Internal efficiency is the capacity of the system to turn out graduates at any level of education in the best way which is
without wastage due to stagnation or repetition. It is also seen as the ability of the education system to meet educational goals and objectives. In this study, internal efficiency is used to refer to the flow of students from the point of entry into the primary schools (standard One) and exit points (standard eight) while considering other contributing variables like availability of teaching and learning materials, school physical facilities and learners family background. Internal efficiency is determined by how a school transforms its inputs into outputs (Okumbe, 2007).

In the Dominican Republic nine years of schooling are compulsory: The last year of preschool education and eight years of primary education. While progress has been achieved regarding enrollment rates, dropout and grade repetition remain important problems (UNESCO, 2006). In 2002, school enrollment of children aged six to 13 reached 85 percent and unlike in many other countries, the enrollment rate of girls is slightly higher than that of boys (Comisión Presidencial Objetivos del Milenio, 2004). Nevertheless, only 53 percent of school beginners finish grade 8 and thus complete primary education. While this represents a massive improvement considering that the percentage was only 22 percent in early 1990s, internal efficiency of the schooling is still insufficient. This can be attributed to high poverty levels and low income earnings in its population.
A study by Weitoft (2004) examined the educational attainment of children who were living with the same single parent (widowed, non-custodial other parent living, non-custodial other parent deceased) and children who were living with the same two parents during the same time frame and noted that “poorer educational performance on the part of the offspring of lone parents can be explained to a large extent by socio-economic disadvantage, especially a lack of resources”.

According to World Bank (2007) non-school factors such as education of parents, child rearing practices, health care and pre-school education have more effect on children access to education, further positive school factors such as teachers and books have more effects in developed countries than in developing countries. Thus, positive effects of school inputs are frequently greater in children from lower socio-economic background than from higher socio-economic background.

Sabates (2010) notes that education levels of the parents have a positive and significant effect on the enrolment of pupils since parental level of education influences parental involvement, support and expectation to their children. Okantey (2008) further argues that parental education level leads to good income which empowers parents to give children solid foundation for schooling.

Ogoye (2007) notes that socio-economic status is a critical issue in many African communities where illiteracy and poverty levels are high, thus limiting parental involvement in homework. In some cases learning and reference materials have to be shared among pupils, and not all parents are able to buy for their children.
personal subject-specific text copies. More important is the fact that some parents expect the children to help them after school, during the time the children are expected to undertake their homework assignments.

Sabates (2010) reports that children are starting primary school in greater numbers than ever before but drop-out rates are significant and this leads to low levels of primary school completion. The pupil completion rates (PCR) declined from 76.8% in 2010 to 74.6 in 2011. The decline in PCR could be attributed to dropouts and repetition occasioned by socio-economic factors such as poverty, child labor and family structure (Economic Survey, 2011).

According to Njeru and Orodho (2003) although there has been a dramatic increase in students’ enrolment in absolute number at primary levels in Kenya, there exists a very deep and severe regional and gender disparities in access to and participation in primary education. Factors responsible for low access vary across the various regions. Those that tend to be common in many areas are of socio-economical nature for instance poverty of household, family size, child labour, occupation of the parents and income of the parents and weak government policies among others are major determinants of demand.
Table 1.1: Primary to secondary transition by gender in Kakamega County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>56.27</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>74.85</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOEST 2013: ETF 2013

In Kakamega East Sub-County, primary to secondary rate has shown a progressive trend majorly due to the FDSE pro-poor initiative. In terms of gender comparison, the transition rates of girls vis a vis boys in Kakamega East fluctuates and can be attributed to factors such as high poverty levels, early marriages of girls, cultural disparities where some communities prefer to support boys education if resources are limited (Republic of Kenya, 2014). This study therefore investigated socio-economic factors influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Kenya’s Vision 2030 indicate much emphasis on the role of education in enabling Kenya become a medium size industrialized nation by 2030 (Vision 2030, 2010).
From the contents of the document it is clear how the education sector need to be able to meet the objectives of the Vision in order to create a sustainable development. However much of the emphasis in the document is also placed on the role of economic and political pillars in advancing national development.

Despite the government’s effort in the funding of primary education through the Free Primary Education, parents have been forced to chip in so as to meet some costs of running of schools (Mwoma, 2008). These costs have become too high for parents to afford given their low average incomes. This has led to disruption of teaching and learning in the schools, students are sent home to collect school fees and other resources. Some students have dropped out of school due to lack of the required resources. Those that absent themselves from school for many days have repeated classes for not completing the school syllabus. This results to educational wastage.

The Education Task Force (ETF) assessment on the internal efficiency of the education sector in Kakamega County indicated it to be low. Cohort survival rates are low and repetition rates and dropout rates are the highest in standard one (repetition rate 6.5%, dropout rate 9.12%) and standard two (repetition rate 5.84%, drop out rate 5.88%). The data from standard 7 to 8 is reflected as follows: in 2009 the county had 50,440 pupils in standard 7 and those who were registered for KCPE in 2010 were 33,821 (67.1%) implying a wastage rate of approximately 33%. The statistics on repetition and dropout are hard to come by since head
teachers know that it is against government policy to limit access to education at 
any level of schooling (Republic of Kenya, 2014). This study therefore 
investigated the socio-economic factors influence on internal efficiency in the 
provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, 
Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors 
influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary 
schools in Kakamega East Sub-County.

1.4 Research objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

i. To determine the extent to which parental level of education influence 
internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools.

ii. To establish the extent to which family structure influence internal 
efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools.

iii. To examine extent to which parental income levels influence internal 
efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools.

iv. To establish the extent to which pupils’ engagement in household duties 
influence internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary 
schools.
1.5 Research questions

The research questions of the study were:

i. To what extent did parental level of education influenced internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?

ii. To what extent did family structure influenced internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?

iii. To what extent did parental income levels influenced on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?

iv. To what extent did pupils’ engagement in household duties influenced on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?

1.6 Significance of the study

The findings of this study may enlighten the school management made up of the School Commitee Members, head teachers and teachers on socio-economic factors influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education. Parents/guardians might be assited in knowing thier roles in ensuring internal efficiency in primary schools and that pupils attend schools regularly. The study findings may help quality assurance and standards officers to improve on access of students and general education standards.

The study findings may be useful to the stakeholders in the Ministry of Education and policy makers to establish areas that that can enhance efficiency in education. It may help the policy makers in provision of primary education to understand
better the allocation and disbursement of funds to public primary schools in the country.

The education planners may use the study findings to advice the government on budget allocation and necessary cause of action to facilitate access in public primary schools. The findings of the study may be used by all stakeholders to minimize or eradicate low access resulting from any quarters.

The parents and pupils may be able to understand the socio-economic factors influencing the internal efficiency in provision of education. This may help them to understand the importance of parental level of education, family structure, parental income levels and pupils’ engagement in household activities on education provision.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The study mainly relied on the questionnaires and interview schedules as instruments for data collection. It was appreciated that these methods mainly relied on self-reporting and might therefore have affected objectivity of the responses.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

The study was basically concerned with investigation on socio-economic factors influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya. Although there are several socio
economic factors like family size, health, and employment influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education, this study was basically concerned with the specific factors; parental level of education, family structure, parental income levels and pupils’ engagement in household activities. The study involved the head teachers, teachers and class eight pupils from the public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County.

1.9 Assumption of study

This study was premised on the following assumptions:

i. The study assumed that the information from the sampled schools reflected the socio-economic factors influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya.

ii. There was a significance relationship between socio economic factors and internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

The following are the significant terms of the study:

**Family structure** refers to the organization and patterning of relationships among individual family members that comprise a family.

**Internal efficiency** refers to an individual or group position within a hierarchical social structure of the school system’s capacity to retain enrolled students to
course completion level with minimum wastage of resources such as time, finance and labour.

Parental income levels refer to the father and mother financial status in the family of the pupils in primary schools.

Parental level of education refers to parents education levels range from K.C.P.E certificate holders and below to degree holders.

Provision of education refers to the schools ability to offer quality education to pupils in primary level.

Pupils’ engagement refers to the relationship between child labour and internal efficiency in the provision of education in primary schools.

Socio-economic factors refer to family status comprise of income, parental education levels, and parental occupation based on mother’s education, father’s education, mother’s occupation, father’s occupation and combined income.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study is organized in five chapters. Chapter one consists of background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definitions of significant terms and organization of the study. Chapter two consists of related literature reviewed;, historical evolution of internal efficiency, influence of
parental level of education, family structures, parental income level, pupils engagement in household duties on internal efficiency, summary of literature reviewed, theoretical framework and conceptual framework of the study.

Chapter three includes research methodology that was employed in carrying out the study. This includes research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity of instruments and reliability of instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter four presents data analysis, interpretations and discussion. Chapter five consist of the summary of the findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the literature that is already in existence regarding socio-economic factors and internal efficiency. It presents an overview of historical evolution of internal efficiency in schools, influence of parental level of education, family structure, parental income levels and pupils’ engagement on internal efficiency, theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

2.2 Historical Evolution of Internal Efficiency

Internal efficiency of an education system is defined as the ability of the education system to turn out its graduates at any level in the most efficient way without wastage, stagnation or repetition Psacharapoulos (1980). Internal efficiency can be measured by class size and student ratio which provide a picture on learning and teaching environment in terms of overcrowding, student-teacher contact and availability of teaching and learning resources.

Kiumi and Chiuri (2005), states that the question of efficiency was raised for the first time by Frederick Taylor, when he wrote a book on; The Principles of Scientific Management. Taylor was partly responsible for the notion of universal applicability. Efficiency was then regarded as both end and a process. Therefore, the term efficiency was also regarded as the reduction of expenditure with the same or higher production. He introduced this concept to educational institutions,
which wanted to achieve efficiency by reducing the unit cost. He also elucidated
different scholars’ notions that the most scholars like Lee Long, (1971); Breneman,
(1970); Bowen and Douglas, (1971); Coombs, (1968); Meeth, (1971); and Bowles,
(1967) belong to the neo-classical economic orientation and consider efficiency as
the ratio between inputs and output.

UNESCO (2002), stated that the concept of efficiency was originally developed
and refined by economists who still defined efficiency as the relationship between
the inputs into a system (be it Agriculture, Industrial or Educational) and the
outputs from that system (be they wheat, vehicles or educated individuals).
Therefore an education system is said to be efficient if maximum output is
obtained with minimum possible input. Inputs and outputs have somehow to be
valued so that they be aggregated and usually prices are used to perform this
valuation function. It also stresses the problems of measuring efficiency in
education, however are considerable.

However, scholars having a progressive orientation had raised the question about
efficiency that determining efficiency only on the basis of inputs and outputs might
not provide an ideal or optimum concept. In this respect, it was believed that
determining efficiency only on the basis of output would be like ignoring the social
benefits of education. Thus, it would be like supporting the capitalist ideology of
an educational system, which is purported to enhance the class system in the
society by sorting out the deviants from the group.
2.3 Influence of parental level of education on internal efficiency in the provision of education

Ersado (2005) talks of the widely accepted notion that parental education is the most consistent determinant of the child’s education and employment decisions. Higher levels of parents education is associated with increased access to education and higher attendance rates as parents tend to be role models for their children. Parents with the same level of education tend to have a positive attitude towards education. In most cases mothers’ education level is seen to have an effect on access Ainsworth (2008).

According to Prinslo (2004), educating one generation has beneficial effects on the next generation. The assumption drawn from this is that children inherit good education qualities from generation to generation hence they may develop into a cultural value to distinguish one society from another. Parents who are educated assist to choose careers for their children and provide good learning environment. This implies that children from well-educated families have more conducive and academically informative environment that propels them to greater and higher education attainment.

In Tanzania, a study by Evans (2008) found out that education of the head and spouse does increase the probability of completion of pupils. Heads having attended primary school increases the girl’s chances of completion by 6.7% and boys by 4%. Ministry of Education in Kenya (2002) showed that parents with
higher level of education ensure that their children remain in school. Parents with low level of education have negative attitudes to education because they do not see the immediate benefit and cannot help their children in areas of academic difficulties which discourage learners hence dropout of school. In Kenya, the government has formulated policies for adult literacy programs and continuing education and non-formal education to mitigate low levels of education.

Research done by UNICEF (2004) in 55 countries and two Indian states found out those children of educated women are much more likely to go to school and complete. The more schooling the women have received the more probable it is that their children will complete their education. In Kenya, a study by Forum for African Women Educationist (FAWE) found out that of the male community members interviewed, 64% had education levels below class 6 and others did not have formal education in Wajir and Mandera districts. One third of women did not have formal education. Therefore in this case children have no aspirations, role models and mentors in the quest for formal education. Lack of education has contributed negatively especially to girls education as they regard it as a waste of time hence prefer educating boys. Sensitization campaigns, barazas, workshops and seminars are used to create awareness to these community members.

According to Nannyonjo (2007) pupils with parents who did not finish primary or just finished primary, and pupils with parents who finished senior four or senior six or university performed considerably better. The highest increase in test scores
was for the pupils whose parents had a university degree. Fathers’ education had a stronger influence than mothers.

2.4 Family structures’ influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education

Hunter and May (2003) describes particularly notable relationship between the family structures and dropping out of school. Children from poor families, single parent families and poorly educated parents have fewer role models in higher education and are more likely to drop-out of school.

There exists a close relationship between absenteeism and variations among the families in the United States. Children who come from families with single parent families and families from racial and ethnic minority status, did not attend school regularly compared to other advantaged families Pryor and Ampiah (2003). Adolescents from certain classes tend to behave in conformity with the standard of environment they come from. The pupils’ personalities and the attitudes of the families to education interact in such a way to encourage drop-out.

Children witnessing violence in their homes suffer serious cognitive, behavioural, emotional and developmental impairments which significantly alter their lives Jaffe (1990). Studies indicate that 50% -70% of the cases in which a parent abuses another, the children are physically abused as well. Adolescents raised in an abusive environment are dramatically more likely to be runways to engage in
teenage prostitution or other delinquent behavior: to be prone to substance abuse or suicide attempts and to commit sexual assaults (Common Wealth of Massachusetts, 1985). Substance abuse affects youth mostly but cuts across all social groups. Alcohol, tobacco, bhang and Khat are the substances most often abused and the youth are also abusing imported illegal substances such as cocaine and mandrax, hence this affects their participation in schools.

Children from unstable families are susceptible to behavior which could undermine their performance in schools Bavora (2008). As early as age three, childrens’ ability to adapt to classroom routines appears to be influenced by their parents’ marital status. For instance children growing up with their own married parents are three times less likely than those in any other family structure to experience emotional or behavioural problems such as attention deficit disorder. Overall, children living with their own married parents have fewer behavioural problems compared to children whose parents are living together but not married. Family structure is a deciding factor in a wide range of children behavior that directly influence academic performance including emotional and psychological distress, attention disorders, social misbehavior, substance abuse, sexual activity and teen pregnancy. The rapid spread of substance abuse can be attributed to the breakdown of indigenous society and to the introduction of foreign influences that have made a variety of substance available on large scale (National Agency for the Campaign against Drug Abuse 2002).
According to Bavora (2008) students living with both parents have lower dropout rates and higher graduation rates compared to students living in other family arrangements. High birth rates are associated with large families and the need for school age children especially in low income families to look after their young siblings.

2.5 Parental income levels and internal efficiency in the provision of education

In Latin America, Africa and South Asia, wastage is prevalent among the pupils or students from low socio-economic background, in the rural than the urban regions and again among girls than the boys. Factors influencing this school wastage according to Eamon (2005) is poverty which may give rise to illness, malnutrition, absenteeism, the opportunity cost of schooling for poor families, cultural factors, which affect girls in particular, inappropriate curriculum and examinations which is excessively academic and designed to prepare majority of pupils for upper secondary and higher education and a shortage of secondary school places, which leads to repetition at the primary.

According to Mwoma (2008) education usually entails expenses such as buying reading materials and stationery. Economic status determines the extent of parental involvement in their children’s education. Parents who are poor and cannot afford to buy supplementary learning materials are less likely to be actively involved in their children’s education. They are preoccupied with different chores to fend for
their families and, paradoxically, children are expected to engage in some form of child labor that can contribute towards family provisioning and sustenance.

Ogoye (2007) notes that socio-economic status is a critical issue in many African communities where illiteracy and poverty levels are high, thus limiting parental involvement in homework. In some cases learning and reference materials have to be shared among pupils, and not all parents are able to buy for their children personal subject-specific text copies. More important is the fact that some parents expect the children to help them after school, during the time the children are expected to undertake their homework assignments. This is against the children’s desires to study in the evening and in a quiet place.

Poverty and economic challenges of the time contribute to lack of motivation, negative self-concept in terms of academic abilities, failures at school, domestic violence, delinquency and higher drop outs (Abagia and Odipo, 1997). The income level is usually determined by the occupation of parents’ hence it is a factor that determines access to education. In Mexico, education expanded significantly between 1970-2000. Enrolments rose from 9.7 million in 1970 to 21.6 million in 2000. The poorest states like Nayarit and Chiapas continued to have low below average enrolment and attendance in schools, hence Mexican government introduced several programs and the main one was ‘Oportunidades’ formerly known as PROGRESSA which provided grants to low income families so that children could attend school and health services.
2.6 Pupils’ engagement in household duties and internal efficiency in the provision of education

Studies have explored the relationship between child labour and children’s educational attainment. As in other developing countries, children in Kenya are engaged in domestic chores, often to the detriment of their education (Kadenyi and Kamuyu; 2006; Chepchieng and Kiboss 2004; FAWE, 2003; Ayoo; 2002). Studies in Kenya have examined child labour in relation to enrolment, attendance (days absent, lateness to school), grade repetition, years of schooling attained, and reading competence.

A survey carried out by Kenyan and Japanese researchers in Kisii Central District, (Omange and Nasongo; 2010), revealed that pupils’ engagement in domestic tasks made them to sleep late and wake up early. In addition to this, learners lamented that their participation in domestic tasks never left them with enough time for doing school assignments and also conducting private study. Other scholars (Khatar et al. 1998; Khandker 1996; Patrinos and Psacharopoulos; 1997; Kanbargi; 1988) have also reported that the fact that a child is working increases the probability of failing a grade (or grade repetition) and even dropping out of school.

2.7 Summary of the related literature reviewed

Literature is reviewed on various socio economic factors influencing internal efficiency in in the provision of education inschools. Enrolment rates were traced with a view of highlighting retention and completion rates which if compromised
by the pupils social background would lead to drop outs, repetition, and poor performance. Studies on internal efficiency have been done mostly in public primary schools and very few in the public secondary schools. Other studies (Khatar et al. 1998; Khandker 1996; Patrinos and Psacharopoulos; 1997; Kanbargi; 1988) have been from developing countries like Nigeria and little in Kenya and more particularly in Kakamega East Sub-County (Okuom, Simatwa, Olel, and Wichenje, 2012).

A study by Bavoro (2008) on primary schools’ dropout rate in Mutare District, Zimbabwe concludes that the biggest cause of school dropout is poverty, followed by economic hardships. It was concluded that the least problem is the early marriages and other known reasons. The problems caused by dropouts in the society were also studied. The most serious problems were drug abuse, alcohol drinking as well as other anti-social and unlawful activities with overstaffing occupying second place and heavy work-loads for teachers being the least menace. This study focuses on socio-economic factors influencing internal inefficiency in Kakamega East Sub County.

2.8 Theoretical framework

This study was based on Educational Production Function theory by Mace (1979). From the production function theory, education process is looked at as where inputs are converted into outputs. An input is a resource that a firm uses in its’ production process for the purpose of creating a good or a service. Education is a
kind of industry where people enter as raw materials and come out as finished products. The need to increase access to education at all levels is vital in the education sector as it improves the transition rates. The function shows the relationship between two or more variables. These variables are; parental level of education, family structures, parental level of income and household duties which are some of the socio-economic factors influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education.

In equation form, production function can be represented as:

\[ A = f(E, S, I, H) \]

where; \( A \) = Achievement, \( E \) = Parental level of education, \( S \) = Family structure, \( I \) = Parental level of income and \( H \) = Pupils engagement in household duties.

On the basis of this theory, this study sought to examine the socio-economic factors influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County. The theory guided this study because it provided a basis of considering socio-economic factors which promote education in the Sub-County for sufficient and efficient human capital. An educated population is productive hence there is need to remove the barriers for the population to access education. If socio-economic factors are managed, they will lead to enhanced enrolment, retention and increased completion rates.
The weakness of this theory is that much of the analysis is in the economics of education. The common inputs are school resources, teacher quality, and family attributes, and the outcome is student achievement. This area is, however, distinguished from many because the results of analyses enter quite directly into the policy process.

2.9 Conceptual framework of the study

The conceptual framework outlines the dependent, independent and intervening variables as discussed in the literature review and elaborated in the Figure 2.1.

**Figure 2.1: Relationship between socio-economic factors and internal efficiency**
Figure 2.1 indicates the interaction between the variables that affect internal efficiency in primary schools. The socio-economic factors which are the independent variables influencing internal efficiency include parental level of education, family structure, parental income levels and pupils’ engagement. Internal efficiency is the dependent variable on the other hand, while school leadership, management and administration act as intervening variables.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology to be used in the research. It focuses on the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research design

Research design refers to the procedures selected by a researcher for studying a particular set of questions or hypothesis; this includes the researcher’s choice of quantitative or qualitative methodology, and how, if at all, causal relationships between variables or phenomena are to be explored (Orodho, 2004).

Descriptive survey design was used since it helps to obtain information concerning the current phenomenon and wherever possible to draw valid general conclusions from facts discussed. Descriptive research determines and reports things the way they are and is intended to produce basic statistical information about aspects of interest (Mugenda&Mugenda, 2003).

3.3 Target population

Target population is a set of people or objects the researcher wants to generalize the results of the research (Jwan, 2010). There were 86 public primary schools in
Kakamega East Sub-County (Kakamega East Sub-County, 2015). The study targeted all the 86 head teachers, 1008 teachers, 3336 standard eight pupils (Kakamega East Sub-County Enrolment report 2015).

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), for descriptive study 10 percent of accessible population is enough. Given that the target population is heterogeneous due to the nature of the schools in the region, stratified random sampling was used to allow full participation of various types of schools. Three strata of respondents was targeted that include the head teachers, teachers and class eight pupils. The study sampled 30% of the schools to give 26 public primary schools to participate.

Best and Khan (2003) recommended a sample size of 20% to 30% ideal for providing reliable data when selected randomly. The study randomly sampled 10% of the 1008 teachers to involve 101 teachers that is about 4 teachers per sampled 26 schools and 10% of 3336 class eight pupils to involve 334 pupils which is about 13 pupils per 26 school sampled schools. This was based on using 10% of target population as recommended by (Mugenda and Mugenda 2003).
Table 3.1: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Eight pupils</td>
<td>3336</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4430</strong></td>
<td><strong>461</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research instruments

These are tools that are used by the researcher to collect data from the sampled respondents in a study (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The questionnaires were used to collect data descriptive data from the teacher and class eight pupils while the head teachers were interviewed to collect quantitative data. The semi-structured questions were used together with open ended questions. It was necessary to combine the closed and a few open-ended response items. The items adopted a likert scale (1-Strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-undecided, 4-Agree, 5-strongly agree). The questionnaires and interview collected data on background information and the study variables.

3.5.1 Validity of the instruments

Validity is exposing the instruments to a small number of respondents to test its suitability. Validity is a measure of how well a test measures what it is supposed to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Validity is the degree to which results
obtained actually represent the phenomenon under investigation. Validity was
established through close consultation and expert judgment of the supervisors;
they verified the validity of the research instruments after the revision of the
questionnaire.

3.5.2. Reliability of the instrument

Reliability is the measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields
consistent results after a repeated trial (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003, Orodho
2004). Test-retest method was used to test the reliability of the instruments. It
involved administering the same instrument twice to the same group within two
weeks. Reliability correlation coefficient ($r$) was calculated using the Pearson
Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

$$ r_{xy} = \frac{N \Sigma XY - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N \Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2][N \Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}} $$

Where

$r$ = Pearson r

$\Sigma x$ = The sum of raw X scores

$\Sigma y$ = The sum of raw Y scores

$\Sigma xy$ = The sum of the product of each X times each Y

$\Sigma X^2$ = The sum of the square of each X-score

$\Sigma Y^2$ = The sum of the squares of each Y-score.

$N$ = The number of paired x & y scores

(Jwan, 2010).
Table 3.2 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>Y²</th>
<th>XY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum X = 121 \quad \sum Y = 123 \quad \sum X^2 = 2095 \quad \sum Y^2 = 2163 \quad \sum XY = 2125 \]

\[ N = 18 \]

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}} \]

\[ = \frac{18(2125) - (121)(123)}{\sqrt{[18(2095 - 121^2)][18(2163 - 123^2)]}} \]

\[ = \frac{23,367}{23434.1107} \]

\[ = 0.9 \]
A coefficient of 0.9 indicated that the instrument is reliable because a coefficient that is close to plus or minus one indicates a strong relationship (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

3.6 Data collection procedure

The first step was to get permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). The County Director of Education (CDE) was informed that the study will take place in the region. The researcher got permission from the Sub County Education Officer to request permission from the head teachers so as to undertake the study in their schools.

3.7 Data analysis techniques

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the information collected (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). According to Kothari (2008), data analysis includes sorting, editing, cleaning, coding, and analyzing data. This was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically as created by the objectives. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data from the interview schedule. The content was organized as per themes drawn from study objectives. Descriptive statistics that is mean and standard deviation was used to analyze quantitative data and then presented in tables, charts and graphs.
3.8 Ethical considerations

Before proceeding to the field, the researcher got permission to collect data from University of Nairobi post graduate school, and then seek a permit from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Participation in the research was voluntary and the researcher got informed consent from the respondents. Permission was sought from head teachers, teachers and class eight pupils during the initial visits to the schools before involving them. The researcher established a good rapport with the respondents. Arrangements was made through the head teacher to meet the respondents. All the respondents were assured that the information was to be treated as confidential and was to be used only for the purpose of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with data analysis, presentation and interpretation. The data analysis and presentation is based on responses to the items in the questionnaires. The data presentation begins with the demographic information of the respondents followed by presentation, interpretation and discussion of research findings based on the research questions.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate

Questionnaire completion/return rate is the number of the sample that participated as intended in all the research procedures.

Table 4.1: Return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Eight pupils</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>77.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>461</strong></td>
<td><strong>361</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4.1 indicates that 26 (100%) head teachers were interviewed, 75 teachers returned their questionnaires out of 101 teachers which was 74.25% return rate. The class eight pupils return rate of the questionnaires was 77.84%,
260 pupils returned their questionnaires. The return rate of 78.30 was deemed appropriate for the study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a 50% response rate is adequate, 60% good and above 70% rated very good. This implies that a response of 78.30% is very good for analysis, as it is representative of the population. This return was therefore deemed appropriate for the study.

4.3 Demographic information of the respondents

The main purpose of this study was to find out the socio-economic factors influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya. As such, the study found it paramount to find out the demographic information of the teachers and head teachers, since they form the basis under which the interpretation of the data collected would be justifiably made.

The researcher found it necessary to establish the general characteristics of the respondents under which the researcher would justifiably make inferences from their responses. The demographic information of the respondents was based on their gender, academic qualifications and the duration in the learning institute.

4.3.1 Demographic information of the head teachers and teachers

The demographic information of the head teachers and teachers was based on their gender, age, and academic qualification, duration in the current institution and duration of teaching for the teachers. The demographic information of the
head teachers and teachers is presented in this section. The head teachers and teachers were asked to indicate their gender. The findings are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Gender of head teachers and teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.2 indicated that majority 57% of the head teachers and 53% of the teachers were male. This shows that there was gender imbalance among the teachers and head teachers. However, the gender distribution was deemed appropriate to give information about the influence of socioeconomic factors on provision of education in the selected schools.

The head teachers and teachers were asked to indicate their academic qualifications. The data is presented in Table 4.3.
### Table 4.3 Head teachers and teachers’ academic qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Certificate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4.3 indicate that the majority of the teachers, 72% and head teachers 58% had P1 certificate as their highest level of education. These findings show that a majority of the teachers and head teachers are professionals who may understand and have knowledge of the socio-economic factors affecting internal efficiency in provision of education of pupils in primary education. School administrators and teachers need various skills and knowledge in order to cope with the emerging issues, schools and environment factors and demands of the teaching task. Such skills and knowledge can be attained through formal training.

Head teachers and teachers were also asked to indicate their work experience. The data is tabulated in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4 Head teachers and teacher’s working experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 reveals that the majority 57% of head teachers had between 5 – 10 years’ experience on managing schools. Based on this result it can be concluded that a majority of the respondents had worked for a long time, so they had enough experience to do their work accordingly and were in a position to give useful insights into the challenges experienced by the pupils in accessing education.

4.3.2 Students’ demographic information

The demographic information of the pupils were based on their type of school. They were able to provide accurate information for the study. The pupils were asked the type of school they learn in.
It can be revealed that there were equal proportions 25% of the respondents from all the different types of schools. The distribution of schools according to the type is deemed appropriate for the study as different students from different types of schools and will provide appropriate diverse information for the study.

4.4 Parental level of education on internal efficiency in the provision of education

The first objective was on the influence of parents’ level of education on pupils enrolment rates in public primary schools. The researcher investigated the parents level of education, parents assisting the pupils with their homework and reasons on pupils dropping out of school. The findings on this objective are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Parents level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University level</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results in Table 4.5, the majority 66% of pupils indicated that their parents were secondary school leavers. It might indicate that fathers have more education and the fathers’ education tend to be more influential than mothers. The
findings are not in line with Al-samarai and Peasgood (1998) who argued that primary education of heads or spouse does increase the chances of school completion rates.

The researcher also sought to identify if parents assist their children in doing their homework.

**Table 4.6 Pupils responses on assistance of homework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not assisted</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on Table 4.6 indicates that the majority 85% of the pupils indicated that their parents did not assist them in doing their homework. The findings are not in line with Pryor and Ampiah (2003), who argued that non educated parents cannot provide support or often do not appreciate the benefit of schooling. Parents’ level of education is crucial because without some level of education assistance cannot be forthcoming. It is evident that most parents do not assist their children with homework may be because they are too poor and pre-occupied with matters of survival to bother about homework; they may be illiterate and unable to be of any help to the child; the home environment may not be conducive for study.
The researcher also requested class-teachers to explain why they thought pupils dropping out of school were attributed to their parent’s low levels of education. The findings are tabulated in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7 Reasons cited by teachers on pupils dropping out of school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household duties at home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to pay school levies</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor academic performance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 indicates that most 46% of the teachers indicated that pupils dropped out of school due to inability to pay school levies. Despite that parents level of education affected the pupils completion rates in schools, the researcher sought to know if the parents made any follow-up on their children’s progress in public primary schools.

The researcher sought to know if the parents made any follow-up on their children’s progress in public primary schools.
Table 4.8 Teachers’ response on parents’ involvement in pupils’ progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often involved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings on Table 4.8 indicates that the majority 64% of the teachers indicated that parents never consulted them or got involved in their children’s progress at school. This reality might be associated with the level of education of parents. Parents who are reasonably educated appreciate the importance and value of education and will tend to be interested in their children’s class work. The opposite is the case where the parents’ education is very low or even absent. Such parents never bother about the school progress of the children and give less attention to education matters.

4.5 Effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education

The second objective was on the influence of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education. Data on this objective was obtained by probing the respondents on the type of family the pupils come from and the
variables in the family structure that influences internal efficiency in provision of education. The findings on this objective are presented in Table 4.10.

The researcher started by looking at the type of family and the results are presented in the Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9 Type of family of the pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygamous</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings on Table 4.9 indicate that most of the pupils 44% came from nuclear family. This is probably because nuclear family is the most preferred type of family to raise a child from since both parents are involved in the children’s development. In this study, a majority of the parents are from other types of family other than nuclear, which is a clear indication or reflection of poor performance in the schools since most of the single parents might be preoccupied in fending for their children at the expense of full involvement in academic performance of their children. This might be the cause of the poor performance by
the preschool going children in Kakamega East Sub County. Family issues results in lack of concentration by the child in his or her school work and thus results in poor academic performance.

This findings agree with a study by Weitoft (2004:134-137) which examined the educational attainment of children who were living with the same single parent (widowed, non-custodial other parent living, non-custodial other parent deceased) and children who were living with the same two parents during the same time frame and noted that “poorer educational performance on the part of the offspring of lone parents can be explained to a large extent by socio-economic disadvantage, especially lack of resources”. According to Chiuri and Kiumi (2005) absenteeism affects efficiency through affecting performance in the National Examinations. Thus cases of absenteeism points to the internal inefficiency in education in Kakamega East district.
Table 4.10: Family structures on pupils’ dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of both parents</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 households members</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed parents</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially stable families</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable families</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on Table 4.10 indicate that the majority 94% of teachers indicated that pupils living with both parents did not miss school frequently while a majority 91% indicated that pupils from single parents are more likely to drop out of school. A majority 94% indicated that pupils from 1 – 5 household members have higher completion rate in school. A majority 99% indicated that pupils from financially unstable families are more likely to drop out of school. A majority 65% of respondents indicated that pupils from wealthier families have less chance of drop-out rates while 94% indicated that pupils from unstable families are susceptible to behavior that can undermine their performance.
4.6 Influence of parental income levels on internal efficiency in the provision of education

The third objective of the study was to investigate the influence of parental income levels on internal efficiency in the provision of education. Data on this objective was obtained by probing the respondents on the income of the parents and the reasons leading to the pupils class drop out.

The researcher investigated the parents’ occupation status/employment. This was to investigate the financial background of the parents and how it affects the pupils academic performance. The findings are presented in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation status of parents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.11 indicate that the majority of the respondents 55% were unemployed. The pupils from unemployed parents performed poorly than those from employed parents. This explains the poor performance by the pupils since majority of the parents is not employed and therefore they are not very capable of
providing the necessary learning materials for their pupils leading to poor academic performance.

The low financial background status perpetuate education deprivation Kasprow (1999) hence the unemployed parents will definitely find it difficult to pay school fees and meet other educational expenses for their children while employed parents have higher income and therefore deploy their resources in a manner creating preschool conditions conducive to a successful school performance. (Prewit, 1989) note that family income level influence education chances for the child since this determines the motivation with which the child pursues basic education.

However, the researcher cited two cases of preschool children whose performance was good and yet they came from poor family background. After investigation the researcher realized that these children get sponsorship from Feed the Children offered to some school children in this area. There were also few cases from the employed parents who performed very poorly. This can be as a result of poor parental commitment due to job occupation.

The researcher then sought to investigate the parents’ average income per month in relation to academic performance. The results are shown in the Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1 Average range of parent’s income per month

The findings on Figure 4.1 indicates that most (35%) of the parents earn less than Kshs. 5,000. This explains the poor academic performance by the pupils in the public primary schools and hence provision of education. This is as a result of inadequate income that the parents are earning and thus are not able to provide the required learning materials to their children to enable them perform well.

The findings are a reflection of Mwoma (2008), who indicated that education usually entails expenses such as buying reading materials, stationery among others. This introduces the element of family economic status into question. Studies have noted that family economic status determines the extent of parental involvement in their children’s education. Parents who are illiterate and poor and cannot afford to buy supplementary learning materials are less likely to be actively involved in their children’s education. They are preoccupied with
different chores to fend for their families and, paradoxically, children are expected to engage in some form of child labor that can contribute towards family provisioning and sustenance at the expense of their education resulting to poor academic performance.

**Table 4.12: Reasons for pupils class drop out**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out of school come from poor families</td>
<td>67 (89%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who perform poorly in academics decide to drop out of school</td>
<td>45 (60%)</td>
<td>30 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils are absent to assist their parents at home.</td>
<td>71 (95%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse results in school dropouts</td>
<td>69 (92%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late school starters drop out before completion</td>
<td>39 (52%)</td>
<td>36 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early school starters drop out before completion</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>63 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who are orphans drop out of school before completion</td>
<td>41 (55%)</td>
<td>34 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who dropout from parents with low level of education</td>
<td>39 (52%)</td>
<td>36 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out are those whose both parents live together</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>61 (81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 4.12 indicates that the majority 89% of the respondents indicated that pupils who drop out of school come from poor families while 60% indicated that
pupils who perform poorly in academics decide to drop out of school. A majority 95% indicated that pupils are absent to assist their parents with work at home. It was also indicated that drug abuse resulted in school dropouts while a majority indicated that late school starters drop out before completion. A majority disagreed that early school starters drop out before completion while the others indicated that pupils who are orphans drop out of school before completion. A majority indicated that pupil who dropout are those of parents whose level of education is low while a majority disagreed that pupils who drop out are those whose both parents live together. Sabates (2010) reports that children are starting primary school in greater numbers than ever before but drop-out rates are significant and this leads to low levels of primary school completion. The pupil completion rates (PCR) declined from 76.8% in 2010 to 74.6 in 2011. The decline in PCR could be attributed to dropouts and repetition occasioned by socio-economic factors such as poverty, child labor and family structure (Economic Survey, 2011).

4.7 Influence of pupils’ engagement in household duties on internal efficiency in the provision of education

The study investigated the influence of pupils’ engagement in household duties on internal efficiency in the provision of education by probing pupils involvement in work at home, teachers enhance pupil socialization to facilitate their performance
in the society, parents adequate provision of pupils’ schools needs and pupils’ involvements in domestic chores affect their academic performance. The study assessed if the pupils are engaged in any work at home and the results are presented in Figure 4.2.

**Figure 4.2 Pupils’ involvement in work at home**

![Pie chart showing 75% Yes and 25% No involvement in work at home.]

The findings on Figure 4.2 shows that the majority 75% of the pupils involved in domestic work at home. The involvement of the pupils in domestic chores is likely to affect their performance in KCPE.

This findings confirms Roschanski (2007) found out that involving children in domestic chores lead to irregular attendance of school leading to poor performance and eventually drop out.
The study assessed if the pupils find domestic work affecting their academic performance the results are presented in Figure 4.3.

**Figure 4.3 Pupils’ involvements in domestic chores affect their academic performance**

![Pie chart showing 80% Yes, 20% No]

The data on Figure 4.3 shows that a majority 80% of the pupils respondents said that their involvement in domestic work at home affect their academic performance at the KCPE. This shows that most of the pupils are involved in domestic chores which are affecting their KCPE performance. Other scholars (Khatar *et al.* 1998; Khandker 1996; Patrinos and Psacharopoulos; 1997; Kanbargi; 1988) have also reported that the fact that a child is working increases the probability of failing a grade (or grade repetition) and even dropping out of school.
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The teachers were asked if the parents adequately provide for their pupils academic needs. The results are presented in Table 4.13.

**Table 4.13 Parents adequate provision of pupils’ schools needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs provision</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of Table 4.13 shows that a majority of the teacher respondents 66% said that parents do not adequately provide for their pupils’ school’s needs. Therefore for improved performance, the parents should be serious in the provision of school’s needs. This will make the children not to be engaged in child labour for their own school needs provision.

This agrees with Moyi (2011) who asserts that poverty is inevitable in poor families; they cannot survive without children’s income contribution. These households are vulnerable to income shocks and cannot afford to keep children in school and in other non-work activities at all times.

The researcher then sought to know if the teachers enhance pupil socialization to facilitate their performance in the society. The results are presented in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14 Teachers enhance pupil socialization to facilitate their performance in the society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on Table 4.14 shows that most 49% of the pupils indicated that teachers enhance their pupils socialization to facilitate their performance in the society. The teachers should be encouraged in enhancing the pupils socialization to enhance their performance in academics. This will improve their Kenya Certificate of Primary Education performance.

Studies have explored the relationship between child labour and children’s educational attainment. As in other developing countries, children in Kenya are engaged in domestic chores, often to the detriment of their education (Kadenyi and Kamuyu; 2006; Chepchieng and Kiboss 2004; FAWE, 2003; Ayoo; 2002). Studies in Kenya have examined child labour in relation to enrolment, attendance (days absent, lateness to school), grade repetition, years of schooling attained, and reading competence.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter covers summary of the study, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the study
The study sought to investigate the socio-economic factors’ influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives; to determine the influence of parental level of education on internal efficiency in the provision of education, to establish the effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education, to examine influence of parental income levels on internal efficiency in the provision of education and to establish the influence of pupils’ engagement in household duties on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools.

The literature review outlined the internal efficiency in schools, summary of literature review, theoretical framework that was based on Educational production function and the conceptual framework. The study employed a descriptive survey research design and 86 public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, 86 head teachers, 1008 teachers, 3336 standard eight pupils. To confirm validity, the
study involved the university supervisors for expert judgment. To confirm reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was carried out.

The responses from the 26 head teachers interviewed, 75 teachers and 260 pupils filling of questionnaires were insightful and elaborated issues in the literature reviewed. The results from the field revealed that a schools’ internal efficiency comprised of the amount of learning during school age attendance, compared to the resources provided. The number of pupils who complete school is often used as (its) measure. Internal efficiency of an education system is revealed by the promotion, repetition and dropout rates.

5.3 Summary of the study findings

It was established that parents’ education level and background is crucial in a pupils’ progress in education. The majority of the teachers 64% indicated that parents never consulted them or got involved in their children progress at school. Similarly the pupils indicated that their parents did not assist them in doing their homework. It was found out that pupils dropped out of school due to inability to pay school levies.

Despite, the parents level of education affected the pupils completion rates in schools, the researcher sought to know if the parents made any follow-up on their childrens’ progress in public primary schools. The pupils indicated that their
parents were secondary school leavers. Fathers have more education and the
fathers’ education tend to be more influential than mothers.

Objective two; to establish the effect of family structure on internal efficiency in
the provision of education. The study established that the composition and
membership of the family and the organization and patterning of relationships
among individual members plays a vital role on the pupils’ education a majority
94% indicated that pupils living with both parents have lower drop-out rate while
a majority 91% indicated that pupils from single parents are more likely to drop
out of school. Pupils from smaller households have higher completion rate in
school.

The majority 99% indicated that pupils from poor families are more likely to drop
out of school. Pupils from wealthier families had less chance of drop-out rates
while pupils from unstable families are susceptible to behavior that can
undermine their performance. Majority of the pupils respondents come from
nuclear family. A few came from polygamous families while others from single
families.

Objective three; to examine influence of parental income levels on internal
efficiency in the provision of education. A majority 89% of the respondents
indicated that pupils who drop out of school come from poor families while others
indicated that pupils who perform poorly in academics decide to drop out of
school. Pupils are absent to assist their parents with work at home. Drug abuse
results in school dropouts this leads to late school starters who drop out before completion. Early school starters were not found to lead to drop out before completion. Pupils who were orphans dropped out of school before completion.

A majority 52% indicated that pupil who dropout are those of parents whose level of education is low. The pupils drop out was not equated to those whose both parents live together. A majority (35%) of the parents earn less than Kshs. 5,000. This explains the poor academic performance by the pupils in the public primary schools and hence provision of education. A majority of the respondents were unemployed. A few self-employed and others employed. The pupils from unemployed parents performed poorly than those from employed parents.

Objective four; to establish the influence of pupils’ engagement in household duties on internal efficiency. The study established that teachers enhance their pupils socialization to facilitate their performance in the society. A majority of the teacher respondents said that parents do not adequately provide for their pupils’ school’s needs. Pupils’ involvement in domestic work at home affect their academic performance at the KCPE. The pupils found domestic work affecting their academic performance. This shows that most of the pupils are involved in domestic chores which are affecting their KCPE performance. A majority of the pupils respondents agreed that they are involved in domestic work at home. This shows that most of the pupils are involved in domestic chores that affect their
KCPE performance as this household chores reduces their study time for exam preparations.

5.4 Conclusions

The study findings led the researcher to conclude that parents levels of income was low. Low parental levels of education causes pupils drop out due to the negative attitudes hence pupils’ low academic progress either, leads to repetition or drop out which affects the completion rates. Family structure has been found to be a major factor that influences inefficiency in schools because children from single parent household are mainly poor hence unable to pay fees.

It can be concluded that household duties affects internal efficiency because pupils are forced to be out of school to attend to household duties and lack concentration due to fatigue associated to household chores.

It can be concluded that pupils’ engagement in household duties influences internal efficiency. The study established that teachers enhance their pupils socialization to facilitate their performance in the society. Pupils involvement in domestic work at home affect their academic performance at the KCPE. This shows that most of the pupils are involved in domestic chores which are affecting their KCPE performance.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the study findings, the researcher recommends the following;
The poverty in the area should be addressed by the community with the assistance of the government for the parents to have reliable sources of income to economically support their children in school. There should be a departure from the reliance on formal or salaried employment which at the moment accounts for less than 30% of the total employment.

Encourage and compel more substantive and sustained involvement of parents and the community in the pupil’s education affairs in schools. Parent-teacher associations are required to be more engaged and assertive. Parents and the communities have tended to be casual and indifferent on matters that relate to pupils education progress maybe because of social-economic circumstances parents and communities have not been very forthcoming. This reality notwithstanding they must be reminded that the education of children is a cordial responsibility. They must cultivate a positive attitude towards the education of their children.

Through PTAs, churches, counseling agencies and grassroots administration, households and communities must be sensitized and educated against negative attitudes and values that tend to undermine the progress of pupils’ education such as child labour, forced marriages and rituals like circumcision that keep victims away from schools for unduly lengthy periods.
Strictly enforce the adherence to the education Act that now has provisions that compel parents and communities to send and facilitate retention of pupils in schools or risk legal sanctions.

A need to continuously strengthen and restructure the quality control system in the ministry of education, redefining its’ role. Focus, modalities and staffing. In this way it will effectively monitor operations in schools including those that relate to activities between schools and parents and the community. They will ensure that mechanisms exist that require the maximum involvement of parents and communities in the education affairs and progress of pupils in schools.

5.6 Suggestions for further study

There should be further research on other socio-economic factors’ influencing internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya since this study focused only on four: pupils’ engagement, parental income levels, family structure and parental level of education.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Introductory letter

Department of Educational Administration and Planning

University of Nairobi,

P.O. Box 30197,

Nairobi.


Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

I am a student from University of Nairobi pursuing a Masters of Education in Educational Planning. I am carrying out a research entitled: “Socio-economic factors influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools in Kakamega East Sub-County, Kenya.” Please allow me to carry the study in you school. The research is meant to help in fulfilling the research objectives. The researcher assures you of the confidentiality of information and no identifications of the respondents.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Edgar Endeheli Avedi
Appendix II: Questionnaire for the teachers

Responses to these questionnaires will have no identities. Please tick (√) where applicable or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

Section A: Background Information

1. (a). What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )
   (b) What is your school type?
       Boy boarding ( ) Girls boarding ( ) Mixed boarding ( ) Mixed day ( )
   (c) Teaching experience? Below 1 year ( ) 2-5 years ( ) 5-10 years ( )
       10 years and above ( )
   (d) Academic qualification P1 Certificate ( ) Diploma ( ) Degree ( ) Masters ( )
       Any other (specify) ____________________________

2. Indicate the number of boys and girls who dropped out in every class.

____________________________________________________________________________

Part B: Parental level of education influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education

3. Do you attribute dropping out of pupils from school to low levels of their parents’ education in your class? Yes ( ) No ( )
   Explain...........................................................................................................

4. How has been general academic performance in your class?
   Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Average ( ) below average ( ) Poor ( )
5. What are the other causes of pupils drop-out from your class?

a) …………………………………………………………………………………………………

b) …………………………………………………………………………………………………

c) …………………………………………………………………………………………………

Part C: Parental income levels influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education

6. Pupils in your class drop out of school due to the following. Circle the number attached to the correct answer. 5-(SA) Strongly Agree, 4-(A) Agree, 3-(UN) Undecided, 2-(D) Disagree, 1-(SD) Strong Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out of school come from poor families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who perform poorly in academics decide to drop out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils are absent to assist their parents with work at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse results in school dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late school starters drop out before completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early school starters drop out before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pupils who are orphans drop out of school before completion

Pupils who drop out are those of parents whose level of education is low

Pupils who drop out are those whose both parents live together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils living with both parents have lower drop-out rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from single parents are more likely to drop out of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from smaller households have higher completion rate in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part D: Effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education

7. The following statements are associated with different types of family structures that affect pupils’ performance in schools and their completion rate. Circle the number attached to the correct answer below; 5-(SA) strongly agree, 4-(A) Agree, 3-(UN) Undecided, 2-(D) Disagree, 1-(SD) Strong Disagree
Pupils from poor families are more likely to drop out of school.

Pupils from wealthier families have less chance of drop-out rates.

Pupils from unstable families are susceptible to behavior that can undermine their performance.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. State common reasons for students’ absenteeism in your class.

i) 

ii) 

iii) 

iv) 

9. The following are the likely causes of dropouts of students in school. Tick the reasons applicable in your school.

(a) Household duties at home [  ]

(b) Inability to pay school levies [  ]

(c) Family structures [  ]

(d) Poor academic performance [  ]

(e) Influence of low levels of parental education [  ]
10. How often are children sent home for the following reasons in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Quite often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of examination money</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No uniform</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money for PA Teachers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money or food for lunch program</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Class eight pupils questionnaire

Academic performance in primary schools can be influenced by several factors. This questionnaire seeks to investigate in particular the influence of socio-economic factors on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools. The information you provide is very important for this study.

Part A: General information

1. What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )

2. How long have you been in this school …………… years

3. How many pupils are enrolled in your class? Boys ( ) Girls ( )

4. What is your parents’ occupational status?
   
   Self-employed [ ]
   
   Employed [ ]
   
   Unemployed [ ]

5. Please indicate the type of your family.
   
   (i) Nuclear family [ ]
   
   (ii) Extended family [ ]
   
   (iii) Polygamous family [ ]
   
   (iv) Single family [ ]
   
   (v) Foster family [ ]
   
   (vi) Any other, please specify ……………………………
Part B: Parental level of education influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education

3. Do you attribute dropping out of pupils from school to low levels of their parents’ education in your class?
   Yes (    ) No (   )

Explain...................................................................................................................

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

5. How has been general academic performance in your class?
   Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Average ( ) below average ( ) Poor ( )

6. What are the other causes of pupils drop-out from your class?
   a) ....................................................................................................................
   b) ....................................................................................................................

Part C: Parental income levels influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education

7. Please indicate your parents income in a month.
   Below 5,000/= (    )
   5000 – 20,000/= (    )
   21,000 – 30,000/= (    )
   Above 30,000/= (    )
8. Pupils in your class drop out of school due to the following. Circle the number attached to the correct answer. 5-(SA) Strongly Agree, 4-(A) Agree, 3-(UN) Undecided, 2-(D) Disagree, 1-(SD) Strong Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out of school come from poor families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who perform poorly in academics decide to drop out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils are absent to assist their parents with work at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse results in school dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late school starters drop out before completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early school starters drop out before completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who are orphans drop out of school before completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most dropouts are female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil who dropout are those of parents whose level of education is low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out are those whose both parents live together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How often are your pupils absent from your class?

(a) Very regularly [ ] (b) Regularly [ ] (c) Never [ ]

Part D: Effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education

10. The following statements are associated with different types of family structures that affect pupils’ performance in schools and their completion rate. Circle the number attached to the correct answer below; 5-(SA) strongly agree, 4-(A) Agree, 3-(UN) Undecided, 2-(D) Disagree, 1-(SD) Strong Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils living with both parents have lower drop-out rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from single parents are more likely to drop out of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from smaller households have higher completion rate in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from poor families are more likely to drop out of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from wealthier families have less chance of drop-out rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from unstable families are susceptible to behavior that can undermine their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part E: Indicators of internal efficiency

11. Do you consider absenteeism as a problem in your class?
   Yes (  )  No (  )
   If Yes how many per week 1 –5 (  )  6 –10 (  )

12. Do you have pupils who have repeated in your class?
   Yes (  )  No (  )
   (b) Give comments on parents/guardian involvement on academic matters of pupils who are repeaters……………………………………………………………………
       ………………………………………………………………………
       ………………………………………………………………………

13. The following factors are likely causes of dropout of students from school. Insert numbers 1,2,3,4 into the boxes attached to the causes of dropout given below according to their order of prevalence:
   1 = Most prevalent; 2 = prevalent; 3 = fairly prevalent and 4 = least prevalent
   i) Low academic achievement [  ]
   ii) Lack of school fees [  ]
   iii) Engage in household duties or child labour at home [  ]
   iv) Absenteeism [  ]
14. How often do parents consult teachers about the progress of their children?

Often (  )  Sometimes (  )  Never (  )

…………………………………………………………………………………………

15. Please indicate other indicators of internal efficiency

a) …………………………………………………………………………………

b) …………………………………………………………………………………
Appendix IV: Interview schedule for head teacher

1. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. What is your age? a) 25 years and below [ ] b) 26-30 Years [ ] b) 31-35 years [ ]
   c) 36-40 years [ ] d) 41 years and above [ ]

3. What is your working experience?
   a) 5 years and below [ ] b) 6 to 10 years [ ]
   c) 11 to 15 years [ ] d) 16 years and above [ ]

4. What is your highest education level?
   a) Certificate [ ] b) Diploma [ ] c) Degree [ ] d) Masters [ ] e) PHD [ ]
   f) Any others, specify

5. To what extent does parental level of education influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

6. What is the effect of family structure on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
7. How does parental income levels influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?

8. To what extent does pupils’ engagement in household duties influence on internal efficiency in the provision of education in public primary schools?
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