# Students' Participation Rates Implications on Quality Education Provision in Public Secondary Schools Education in Kenya

## Dr. Nelson Siocha Omae (PhD)[1], David Onyancha Omae[2]

School of Education, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, P.O. Box 210-40601, Bondo, Kenya

**Abstract:** *The purpose of the study was to investigate students' participation rates implications on quality education provision in public secondary schools education in Kisii County, Kenya. The objective of the study was to investigate students' participation rates implications on quality education provision in public secondary schools education. The study adopted sequential explanatory design that was employed within mixed methods approach. The target population constituted of 334 principals and 334 class teachers. The sample size constituted of 181 principals and 181 class teachers selected through stratified random sampling technique. Instruments for data collection were questionnaires. Reliability was done by piloting through the split-half method. Quantitative data for the study was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. All the correlation coefficients associated with the students' participation rates parameters were fairly low but had statistical significance. The parameter dropout, had the highest Product-Moment of Correlation Coefficient (.654, p=.001) and repetition was at .370. The variable with least Product Moment Correlation Coefficients was retention [r=.310, p=.001. This study will help in decision making to the ministry of education and all other stakeholders in implementing policies that enhance students' participation rates for quality education provision. This study recommends that the Ministry of Education (MoE) and schools revisit their policies related to students' participation rates parameters and work towards their implementation.*

**Keywords:** participation rates, Dropout rate, retention rate, Repetition rate, public secondary schools, Quality education and Kenya

## 1. Introduction

UNICEF (2000) asserted that quality education includes learners who are healthy, well-nourished and ready to participate and learn, and supported in learning by their families and communities; school environments that are healthy, safe, protective and gender-sensitive, and provide adequate resources and facilities; content that is reflected in relevant curricula and materials for the acquisition of basic skills, especially in the areas of literacy, numeracy and skills for life, and knowledge in such areas as gender, health, nutrition, HIV/AIDS prevention and peace; processes through which trained teachers use child-centred teaching approaches in well-managed classrooms and schools and skilful assessment to facilitate learning and reduce disparities and outcomes that encompass knowledge, skills and attitudes, and are linked to national goals for education and positive participation in society.

Bernard (1999) asserted that quality of education entails all aspects of the school and its surrounding education community, the rights of the whole child, and all children, to survival, protection, development and students' participation rates. This means that the focus is on learning which strengthens the capacities of children to act progressively on their own behalf through the acquisition of relevant knowledge, useful skills and appropriate attitudes; and which creates for children, and helps them create for themselves and others, places of safety, security and healthy interaction.

Adeogun (2001) discovered a very strong positive significant relationship between instructional resources and academic performance. According to Adeogun, schools endowed with more resources performed better than schools that are less endowed. This corroborated the study by Rose

(2000) that private schools performed better than public schools because of the availability and adequacy of teaching and learning resources. Adeogun (2001) discovered a low level of instructional resources available in public schools and stated that our public schools are starved of both teaching and learning resources. He expresses that effective teaching cannot take place within the classroom if basic instructional resources are not present. Republic of Kenya (2010) noted that the educational system has stipulated various activities, materials and requirements which are inadequate that need to be provided at all levels of the system in order to meet the objectives of education. The nature of the curriculum pre supposed that infrastructure, laboratories, workshops, classrooms, equipment, physical facilities and teaching aid would be provided to implement the scheme successfully.

A report from Ministry of Education, Kisii County, statistics office (2012) noted that enrolment has increased in Kisii County. The area has 72 percent public secondary schools, comprising of mixed day-secondary schools out of a total of 317 secondary schools. Kisii County Principals Association Manual (MOEST, 2013) indicates that the county had the highest dropout rate of 27.6% when compared with others and completion rate of approximately 67% for most schools. Girls had a dropout rate of 16.4% and boys 11.2%. A report released by Ministry of Education, Kisii County Quality Assurance and Standards office (2014) asserts that policies addressing matters of students' safety measures, school enrollment and retention such as re-entry, repetition and bridging of the gender gap have not been adhered to and this has a great effect on the participation rates in the public secondary schools. This scenario may pose educational quality challenges. The report further highlight that for the years, 2011; 2012; 2013 and 2014 Public Secondary schools indicate that promotion, retention and completion levels

have been noted to be high but the challenges of dropouts and repetitions still exist in varying proportions between boys and girls.

A report by Kisii County Education Government (2014), a conference held by scholars, parents, professionals, political leaders and other players held at Kisii University Grounds indicated that there is need for research on the cause of dwindling quality education in Kisii County. It further noted that our students are not learning despite the impressive enrolment rates in the County and only further research can help establish the problem. It is against this scenario that that the study intended to explore selected predictors of quality education and their implications on public secondary schools in Kisii County.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

The quest to achieve Education for All (EFA) is fundamentally about ensuring that students' gain of the knowledge and skills they need to better their lives and to play a role in building more peaceful and equitable societies. As many societies strive to universalize basic education, they face the momentous challenge of providing conditions where genuine learning can take place for each learner for quality education. This is why focusing on quality education is an imperative for achieving EFA. During the past decade, much has been done globally to provide quality basic education for children, an obligation for the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In Kenya, the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQA&S) department in the Ministry of Education (MoE) is charged with the responsibility of ensuring quality. Statistical reports from MoE on Kisii County assert that, despite the fact that major strides have been made to provide quality education through Free Secondary Education (FSE) policy, the policy seems not to be successful going by the current indicators of exhibit of low quality education. This is evidenced by low students' participation rates. This scenario has raised concern because it means that resources devoted to education are being wasted, and this may jeopardize the future of education system in Kenya as a whole and Kisii county in particular. While some studies done in Kisii have attempted to address the issue, they did not isolate and investigate students' participation rates implications on quality education provision in public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya. Therefore, it is against this worrying trend that prompted the researcher to undertake a study to investigate students' participation rates implications on quality education provisionin public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya.

### Objective of the study
The following was the objective of the study:
To find investigate students' participation rates implications on quality education provisionin public secondary schools.

## 3. Research Methodology

### Research design
The study adopted a mixed method research approach. The sequential explanatory design was employed within mixed methods approach. Its purpose is to use qualitative results to assist in explaining and interpreting the findings of quantitative study.

### Sampling procedures and sample size
The County had 334 public secondary schools against 334 principals and 344 senior teachers. Simple random sampling was used to select schools, which were sampled in each category. The lottery technique was applied where a symbol YES was placed on 181 out of 334 public secondary schools. In this case, the schools of the 181 principals who picked a yes were automatically included in the sample.

### Research instruments
The research used questionnaires and principals, and class teachers to collect primary data for the study.

### Reliability of instruments
The split-half method was used to ascertain the reliability of the questionnaires, using the Split-Half reliability by Spearman Brown Formula: An SPSS output indicates a correlation coefficient (r = 0.826) greater than 0.6.

### Data analysis
The quantitative data collected was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics using Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient Correlation

## 4. Findings, Interpretation and Discussion

### Descriptive analysis of the Study
The study sought the views of the principals and class teachers with respect to the likert scale pertaining to students' participation rates. Their responses were computed in frequency, percentages, total frequency, total score and mean of means.

### Testing Hypothesis on Students' Participation Rate of the Study
In this study, students participation rate were converted into continuous ratio scale, with values ranging from 1 to 5. It was therefore suitable to establish the input between the parameters using correlative methods and quality education. Therefore all the hypothesis was tested using inferential statistics mainly based on correlation and regression analysis. A bivariate correlation (zero-order correlation) was used to explore the relationship between the parameters by computing a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. All data was analyzed at a level of significance at 95% (p.v = 0.05). This value chosen was the most popular and acceptable level of significance test (Creswell, 2002). By this testing level, the researcher allowed 5% percent error margin. This meant that the results were 95% true as was found. Table 4.13 shows correlations on elements of predictors on students' participation rate parameters (zero order correction matrix).

**Table 4:** Correlations on Elements of Predictors Students' Participation Rate (Zero Order Correlation Matrix)

|  |  | Dropout | Repetition | Retention |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dropout | Pearson Correlation | 1 |  |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  |
|  | N | 144 |  |  |
| Repetition | Pearson Correlation | .654** | 1 |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |  |
|  | N | 144 | 145 |  |
| Retention | Pearson Correlation | .370** | .310** | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 |  |
|  | N | 137 | 137 | 137 |

**\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
From Table 4.13, showing the Product Moment Correlation Coefficients, all the parameters were significantly positively (PV < .05) correlated to quality education. All the correlation coefficients associated with the students' participation rates in public secondary schools in Kisii County were all fairly low but had statistical significance. The parameter dropout, had the highest Product-Moment of Correlation Coefficient (.654, p=.001) and repetition was at .370. The variable with least Product Moment Correlation Coefficients was retention [r=.310, p=.001. In conclusion, a decision was reached on the following hypotheses;

$H_o3$: There is no statistical significant relationship between students' participation rates and quality education in public secondary schools.

$H_a3$: There is statistical significant relationship between students' participation rates and quality education in public secondary schools.

Given that level of significance was attained in all the variables, the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence, from this analysis a conclusion was reached that there is statistical significant relationship between students' participation rates and quality education in public secondary schools. There was a positive correlation between the parameters of the Students' participation rate variable at a significance level of 0.01.

Table 4.0 shows coefficients of parameters that were used in making comparisons on their unique contributions to the students' participation rate variable. To compare the different parameters of the participation rate, a standardized coefficient was used because the values for each of the different parameters were converted to the same scale so that they could be easily compared. However, in constructing a regression equation, the unstandardized coefficient values listed as B were used. Given that the interest was to compare the contribution of each independent variable the Beta values were considered.

**Table 4.2:** Coefficients of the Students' Participation Rate

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
|  | (Constant) | .008 | .001 |  | 6.091 | .000 |
|  | Retention | -1.386 | .687 | -.233 | -2.018 | .046 |
|  | Dropout | .770 | .495 | .175 | 1.554 | .123 |
|  | Repetition | .084 | 1.284 | .006 | .065 | .948 |
| Dependent Variable: Students' Participation Rate | | | | | | |

Table 4.2 was made to evaluate the contribution of each of the parameters to the variable in question. The largest Beta coefficient was .175 which was for dropout rate implying it made the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable; the second largest Beta coefficient was .006 which was for repetition, implying it made the second strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model was controlled for. The parameter, retention had a lower Beta value of -2.33 which show that it had the least contribution to the model. Surprisingly, it was discovered that the parameters dropout rate and retention rate had no significance (P-value<0.05) to the model while the repetition was statistically significant.

Table 4.3 shows regression model summary for the students' participation rate. It indicates the coefficient of multiple determination (R squared), a statistical measure of how close the data are fitted to the regression line.

**Table 4.3:** Regression Model Summary for Students' Participation Rate Variable

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .180[a] | .032 | .010 | .001180370 |

Table 4.3, it was noted that the coefficient of multiple determination for students' participation rate variable and quality education, R squared value for the model was (.032 or 3.2 per cent explained variance). The total R squared value, included the unique variance explained by each variable and also that shared. R squared = 3.2 per cent, this implies that the students' participation rate variable in question accounts for 3.2% variability in quality education and the unexplained variation 96.8% are the students' participation rate variable not considered in the equation that would contribute to the impact of quality education. The parameters were reasonably not strongly correlated; hence there were little of shared variance that was statistically removed when they were all included in the model

## References

[1] Apida R. A. (2010). Influence of the home environment on learners' participation rates in public day secondary schools in Nairobi north district, Kenya. (Unpublished Masters project), University of Nairobi.

[2] Boyle, S., Brock, A., Mace, J., and Sibbons, M. (2002). Reaching the poor: The 'costs' of sending children to school. A six country comparative study. (Educational Papers). London: Department for International Development. Brothers.

[3] Bryk, A.S. and Thum, Y.M. (1989).The Effects of high School Organization on Dropping out: an Exploratory Investigation. American Educational Research Journal, 26(3), 353- 383.

[4] Creswell, J. and Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Mixed Methods Research,* (California Sage Publications)

[5] Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., and Meyerson, D. (2005). School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals (Review of Research)

[6] Dre`ze, J. and Kingdon, G. (2001). *School Participation in Rural India*. Review of Development Economics, 5(1), 1-24.

[7] Fuller, B. and Dellagnelo, L. (1999). *How to raise children's literature*. The influence of family, teacher and classroom in North East Brazil. Comparative education review. Context of schools. http://portal.org/education

[8] Gray, J. & Hackling, M. (2009). Wellbeing and Retention: A Senior Secondary Student Perspective. The Australian Educational Researcher, 36(2), 119-145.

[9] Habegger, S. ( 2008). *The principal's role in successful schools: creating a positive school culture.* Educational Leadership, 88(1), 42-46. Performance in National Examinations. Government Printers.

[10] Howell, D. (2002). *Statistical Methods for Psychology*. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

[11] Institute of Policy *Analysis and Research.* (2007). Making Public Secondary Education Affordable: IPAR Policy View Issue 3: Institute of Policy Analysis and Research. Nairobi. Kenya.

[12] Israel T., Maphosa W. and Beginner M. (2012). The Influence of Learners' Participation in School Co-curricular Activities on Academic Performance: Assessment of Educators' Perceptions; University, Department of Education and South Africa University of Venda, Centre for Higher Education Teaching and Learning, South

[13] Kisii County Government, (2014). Enhancing Quality Education for Development in line with vision 2030. Unpublished information booklet, Kisii County Government.

[14] Lloyd, C. B. (2001. *Determinants of educational attainment among adolescents in Egypt*: does school quality make a difference?. Population Policy Research Division Working Papers. No. 150. Population Council, New York.

[15] Masibo, K. and Kiragu, K. (2007).*Where Many School Girls miss School over old, Harmful Ritual;* High rise of Female Circumcision in Rift Valley Worries Experts as, Pupils are married off quickly. Nairobi: Government Press.

[16] Mbilingi M. and Mbughimi, K. (1991). *Education in Tanzania with a gender perspective summary report.* Sweden International Development Authority. Education Document No. 53.

[17] Ministry of Education (2014). Quality assurance and standards office *http: //www.kisii.go.ke/index.* php/socio-economics /item/ 1650-tsc-kisii-county-branch. Ministry of Education, (2005) *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme* (KESSP) (2005 – 2010).Ministry of Education. Kenya Nairobi.

[18] Kisii County Government (2014). Kisii County Education Conference. Action and Progress to Improve Quality education. Allafrica Publishers.

[19] Mugenda, M and Mugenda, G (2013) *Research methods.* Quantitative and qualitative Approaches, Nairobi, Acts Press.

[20] Otieno, W. (2003b).*Gender and Education; the challenge of Educating Girls in Kenya*. Report prepared for Action Aid. Nairobi: Elimu Yetu Coalition.

[21] Republic of Kenya (2008). *Safety Standard Manual for Schools in Kenya*. Nairobi: Government printer.

[22] Republic of Kenya , *(2005*a). Sessional Paper number I of 2005. A policy framework for education Training and Research; Meeting the Challenges of Education Training and Research in Kenya. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[23] Rumberger, R. W. and Thomas, S. L. (2000). *The distribution of drop outs and turnover rates among urban and Suburban High schools*. Sociology of Education.

[24] Sava, L. A. and Orodho, A. J. (2014). Selected Critical Socio-Economic Factors Influencing. Pupils' Access to Education in Kibera Informal Settlement in Nairobi County, Kenya. Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, Kenyatta University. Kenya. andrewsava1@yahoo.com

[25] Suliman, E. A. and El-Kogali, S. E. (2003). Why are the children out of school?: Factors Affecting Children's Education in Egypt. A Paper for the ERF 9th annual conference. ussex Brighton BN1 9RE United Kingdom.

[26] Sunita C. (2011). *Dropout in Secondary Education*: A Study of Children Living in Slums of Delhi; National University of Educational Planning and Administration 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi- 110016. India.

[27] UNESCO. (2012). Youth and Skills: Putting Education to work. EFA Monitoring Report. UNESCO.

[28] UNICEF. (2007). Progress for children: a world fit for children statistical review. http://www.unicef.org/progressforchildren/2007n6/index_41797.htm

[29] United Nations. (2014).*The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/history.shtml

[30] Valgas, M and Agalar, L. (2004). *Gender Makes the Difference*. IUCN.Geneva. 2P