

The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya

Effie Rarite Punyua¹, Timothy C. Okech², Tabitha Nasieku³

¹Department of Commerce and Economic Studies, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

²Associate Professor of Economics, United States International University-Africa

³Chair, Department of Economics Accounting and Finance School of Business, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Corresponding Author: Effie Rarite Punyua

ABSTRACT

Background: Education is considered as critical human capital necessary for the realization of country's growth potential. It is also considered both a human right and a vital means of promoting peace and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms generally. In the realization of these, the government of Kenya introduced free primary education (FPE) in 2003. The purpose of the study was to analyze the influence of FPE education in Kenya by focusing on its effect on enrolment; availability of learning resources and the quality of teaching.

Materials and methods: The study targeted 36 respondents namely 15 ministries of education management staff, 11 Kenya Union of Teachers officials and 10 Teachers service commission senior management staff. The study applied multi-faceted approach by collecting primary data as well as conducting desk review. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire that had both closed and open ended questions. Data collected was analyzed using SPSS and presented in tables

Results: The study reveals that introduction of FPE negatively impacted on resources available for teaching resources including. This also impacted on the teacher effectiveness in terms of teaching methodology, pupil discipline control, and management of examinations and effective use of teaching and learning resources. In addition, the teachers have little capacity for effective pupil engagement, which is instrumental in improving teacher effectiveness. Within the FPE set-up efficient teaching workforce satisfaction has not been conducive; thereby diminishing the instruments to reward motivate the teachers. Specific challenges that significantly affect teacher effectiveness include large class size, teacher inadequacies and pupil age variation.

Conclusion: The introduction of FPE in 2003 by the Government of Kenya led to notable strains in the ability of primary schools to offer quality education. The advent of FPE has also affected the capacity of current coaching force. The specific facets of teacher effectiveness that the initiative apparently jeopardized include teaching methodology, pupil discipline control, and management of examinations and effective use of teaching and gaining knowledge of resources. Within the FPE set-up efficient teaching workforce satisfaction has not been conducive; thereby diminishing the instruments to reward motivate the teachers. Specific challenges that significantly affect teacher effectiveness include large class size, teacher inadequacies and pupil age variation.

KEY WORDS: Enrolment, Learning resources, Quality Education, Teacher Pupil Ratio

1. INTRODUCTON

Education is an important Investment that every state needs to make and ensure its accessibility as a way to promote social and monetary development of the nation (Yieke and Felicia, 2006). Education is also considered as a human right and an essential approach of promoting peace and appreciates for human rights and crucial freedoms normally(UNESCO, 2000). It contributes towards building an extra nonviolent world is to be realized, training need to be made universally available and equally reachable to all (UNESCO, 2000).Education is a solid foundation for progress and sustainable development, it is also an inherent human right

and critical step towards dismantling the gender discrimination that threatens all other rights thus catalyzing freedom and democracy within borders and extending its reach as an agent of international peace and security (Vreede, 2003). It is prerequisite to many rights guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).The African countries resolved that there should be universal primary education (UPE) and the eradication of illiteracy in Africa by20 years (UNESCO, 2005). Moreover, a global initiative education for all (EFA) was released in Jomtien, Thailand; in 1990 to convey the blessings of education to "every citizen in every society." they reiterated their

commitment to EFA in Dakar, Senegal, in April 2000 and again in September 2000 due to slow progress in its implementation.

During the September 2000 meeting in Dakar, Senegal, 189 countries and their partners adopted the two EFA goals that are also Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Dakar framework for motion adopted a global announcement on schooling for all (EFA) in 2000, which hooked up the purpose to provide each woman and boy with primary school education by 2015. It also simply identified inclusive training (IE) as a key strategy for the development of EFA. One of the maximum critical advances for humans with disabilities within the closing decade has been the UN convention on the Rights of folks with Disabilities (Yieke and Felicia, 2006). You need to demonstrate that the Kenya government as a signatory to the conventions went ahead and introduced free primary education. Demonstrate how it was done to show a gap that merits attention.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study focused on FPE in the whole country by targeting public primary schools. Primary data involved 15 ministries of education management staff, 11 Kenya Union of Teachers officials and 10 Teachers service commission senior management staff. The established variable (performance) in this situation changed into measured in terms of: the students' enrolment, availability of learning assets, control of scholars' discipline and Quality of Teaching.

Study Design: The research design was a descriptive research design that ensured collection and descriptive analysis of data from the population of study. The design allows for the determination and reporting the way things are and attempts to describe such things as possible behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics.

Study Location: All public primary schools in Kenya from the year 2003 to 2013 where secondary data was used. Primary data involved targeting 15 ministries of education management staff, 11 Kenya Union of Teachers officials and 10 Teachers service commission senior management staff since they are the key stakeholders that understands student enrollment in Kenya

Study duration: June to November 2017

Sample Size: The study employed census techniques to obtain a sample of 36 respondents.

Subjects & selection method: According to Fleshman (2005), a sampling frame is the source material or device from which a sample is drawn. It is a list of all those within a population who can be sampled, and may include individuals, households or institutions. For this study sampling frame was the ministry of education, all public primary schools in Kenya and Non-government organizations

which support education. The study employed census techniques to obtain a sample of 36 respondents.

Procedure methodology: Primary data was gathered using questionnaires. The researcher obtained authorization letter from the university and National Commission for Science and Innovation (NACOSTI). The researcher visited the Ministry of education head office as well as the Teachers Service Commission offices where the questionnaires were issued. Secondary data was sourced from the review of published and unpublished material, journals, academic papers and periodicals. The study was also based on analysis of reports by government ministries, nongovernmental organization, and schools.

Statistical analysis: Secondary data collected was edited by ensuring that it is complete and correct thus reduces bias, increases precision and thus achieving consistency. The data was then analyzed by use of regression analysis and the descriptive statistics which is the correlation. The presentation of analysis was through frequency tables. SPSS 22.0 software was used for the study. Data from questionnaires was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as the mean and percentages. The analysis was then visually displayed using graphs, frequency tables and charts. A multiple regression model will be applied to analyze the relationship between the various variables. The model will treat academics performance as the dependent variable while the independent variables are pupil's enrolment, learning resources and quality of teaching. The relationship equation was as shown below-

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$$

Where Y = Academic performance

α = Constant term

β_1 = Beta co-efficient

X_1 = Pupils Enrolment

X_2 = Learning resources

X_3 = Quality of teaching

ϵ = Error term

The model helped to better understand which among the independent variables are related to the dependent variable and to explore the form of their relationship. The analysis was then be displayed visually by the use of frequency tables.

3. RESULTS

Table 1 shows summary on pupil's enrolment. Majority of respondents agreed that there has been an increase in the number of pupils between the year 2003 to 2015 as evidenced by ($M=3.8266$ $SD=1.21319$), this shows that free primary education has seen growth in enrolment on the area under study as compared to the previous years. On whether each year has recorded increase enrolment, majority of agreed that there has been an increase in enrolment each year which was evidenced by ($M=4.2056$ $SD=0.93192$), this shows that free primary education has recorded high enrolment each year. Majority of respondents were neutral

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

that increased enrolment has led to increased Performance among pupils which was evidenced by (M=3.1667 SD=0.91026), this shows that high pupils enrolment did not have positive impact on performance. Majority of

respondents agreed that the government has provided each pupil with an opportunity to enroll as evidenced by (M=3.8056 SD=0.98036), this shows that the government has opened doors for all pupils to enroll.

Table 1. Statistics of FPE and Pupils Enrolment

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
There has been an increase in the number of pupils between the year 2003 to 2015	36	3.8266	1.21319
Each year has recorded increased enrolment	36	4.2056	.93192
Increased enrolment has led to increased performance among pupils	36	3.1667	.91026
The government has provided each pupil with an opportunity to enroll	36	3.8056	.98036

Table 2 shows the pupil’s enrolment to free primary education in Kenya between the year 2003 to 2015. The table shows that 7, 200,000 million pupils enrolled in the year 2003 which was 102.8 %, in 2004, there was 7,395,000(104.8%), in 2005 there was 7,603,000 (107.2%), in 2007, 8,330,000 enrolled representing 107.6 %, in the 2008 8, 564, 000 enrolled which was 109.8%, 2009, there was 8,831,000 which was 109.0%, in 2010, 9,831,000 (110.0%), in 2011, there 9,381,000(110.0%), in 2012 enrolment was 9, 858,000 representing 110.4%, in 2013, enrolment was 9,890, 000 (110.5%), in 2014, there was 9,559,072 pupils which was 109.7%. In the year 2015, there 9,959, 746 in FPE, representing 111.0%. This shows that there has been tremendous increase in enrolment, high number of pupils enrolment led to poor academic performance as quality was not improved which agrees with Oketch and Somerset (2010)

who argued that there were high rates of enrolment in various schools when free primary education (FPE) was introduced in Kenya.

The table shows that there has been tremendous increase in pupils enrolment from 7,200,000 million (102.8%) in 2003 to 9,950, 746 (111.0%), Pupil’s enrolment had a mean of 8771139.8462 and a standard deviation of 1049054.33000. this shows that free primary education has been very effective in terms of enrolment as many unschooled children were able to access education. Free primary education compromised on academic performance which agrees with Oketch and Somerset (2010) who argued that there were high rates of enrolment in various schools when free primary education (FPE) was introduced in Kenya.

Table 2. Pupils Enrolment between the Years 2003-2015

Year	Total Number of Pupils (in millions)	Percentage Change in Enrolment
2003	7, 200, 000	102.8
2004	7, 395,000	104.8
2005	7,603,000	107.2
2006	7,632,000	107.4
2007	8,330,000	107.6
2008	8,564,000	109.8
2009	8,831,000	109.0
2010	9,831,000	110.0
2011	9,381,000	110.0
2012	9,858,000	110.4
2013	9,890,000	110.5
2014	9,559,072	109.7
2015	9,950,746	111.0
Total Mean	8771139.8462	99.9%
Standard deviation	1049054.33000	

Table 3 shows summary of response on quality of teaching. Majority of respondents were neutral that the government has employed more teachers to cater for growing number of

pupils as evidenced by (M=3.0282 SD=1.17118), this shows that the government has not really employed adequate number of teachers to handle the growing number of pupils.

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

Respondents disagreed that the government has provided adequate sitting desks for pupils as evidenced by (M=2.3889 SD=0.49441), this shows that public primary schools continue to experience shortage of desks due to high number of enrolled pupils, the government has not done much to increase the number of desks. Respondents were neutral that the government has provided quality learning materials for

pupils as evidenced by (M=2.5000 SD=0.84515), this shows that the government has done very little to improve the quality of learning materials. Respondents disagreed that teachers are regularly trained on changing trends in education sector as evidenced by (M=1.8611 SD=1.01848), this shows that lack of regular training was a major hindrance for teachers in offering quality education.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of FPE and Quality of Teaching

Table 3 shows summary of response on quality of teaching.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The government has employed more teachers to cater for growing number of pupils	36	3.0282	1.17118
The government has provided adequate sitting desks for pupils	36	2.3889	.49441
The government has provided quality learning materials for pupils	36	2.5000	.84515
Teachers are regularly trained on changing trends in education sector	36	1.8611	1.01848

Majority of respondents were neutral that the government has employed more teachers to cater for growing number of pupils as evidenced by (M=3.0282 SD=1.17118), this shows that the government has not really employed adequate number of teachers to handle the growing number of pupils. Respondents disagreed that the government has provided adequate sitting desks for pupils as evidenced by (M=2.3889 SD=0.49441), this shows that public primary schools continue to experience shortage of desks due to high number of enrolled pupils, the government has not done

much to increase the number of desks. Respondents were neutral that the govt has provided quality learning materials for pupils as evidenced by (M=2.5000 SD=0.84515), this shows that the govt has done very little to improve the quality of learning materials. Respondents disagreed that teachers are regularly trained on changing trends in education sector as evidenced by (M=1.8611 SD=1.01848), this shows that lack of regular training was a major hindrance for teachers in offering quality education.

Table 4. Quality of Teaching Resources

Year	Teacher to pupil ratio	Number of Teachers	Number of schools	Average number of teachers per school
2003	52:1	177,100	17,500	10
2004	60:1	178,184	17,855	11
2005	53:1	171,033	17,999	10
2006	51:1	169,311	18,124	9
2007	52:1	173,153	18,361	9
2008	54:1	170,059	18,491	9
2009	55:1	171,301	18,543	9
2010	55:1	173,388	19,059	9
2011	54:1	174,267	18,849	9
2012	42:1	175,222	20,307	9
2013	45:1	175,300	21,205	8
2014	41:1	176,700	21,274	8
2015	42:1	177,111	22,113	8
Mean	50:1	174,009		
Standard deviation		2851.58199		

The table 5 shows summary on learning resources, majority of respondents agreed that the government has allocated adequate financial resources for schools as evidenced by (M=3.5484 SD=1.31546), this shows that the government has

been increasing financial allocation every for public primary schools but the finances was misappropriated and therefore did not reach the intended purpose. Respondents disagreed that there is sufficient learning materials for all pupils as

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

evidenced by (M=2.1944 SD=0.70991), this shows that the learning materials allocated to pupils were inadequate as pupils were required to share the available learning materials.

Respondents disagreed that the government has built adequate classrooms to accommodate high number of pupils as evidenced by (M=2.4444 SD=0.73463), this shows that the

government has not allocated adequate resources to increase the number of classrooms despite the high pupils enrolment. Respondents were neutral that the government has provided uniforms for pupils as evidenced by (M=2.8056 SD=0.66845), this shows that very little money has been allocated to cater for children uniforms as parents were forced to buy uniforms for their children

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on FPE and Learning Resources Between the year 2003-2015

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The government has allocated adequate financial resources for schools	36	3.5484	1.31546
There is sufficient learning materials for all pupils	36	2.1944	.70991
The government has built adequate classrooms to accommodate high number of pupils	36	2.4444	.73463
The government has provided uniforms for pupils	36	2.8056	.66845

Table 6 shows the government financial allocation to free primary education from the year 2003 to the year 2015. In year 2003, the government allocation was kshs 98.7 billion, 2004 (kshs 109,381.9 billion), 2005 (113,987.3 billion), in 2006 (kshs 118.80 billion), in 2007 (kshs 122, 869.0 billion), in 2008 (139, 879.8), in 2009(154, 405.4 billion), in 2010(198, 095.9), in 2011 (213,200.0), in 2012 (220,400.0) in 2013(230, 780.0), in 2014(234,567.0), in 2015(256,678.0), this shows that the government has been increasing the annual allocation to free primary education each year. The study findings agrees with Voss et al., (2004) who argued that the allocation of funds influenced the implementation of the FPE as the amount allocated to child by the government was not adequate.

The mean financial allocation per school since the implementation of free primary education was 5, 640,000 in 2003, 6,126,121 in 2004, 6,332,979.6 in 2005, 6,554,844.4 in 2006, 6,691,846 in 2007, 7,564,750.4 in 2008, 8326883.5 in 2009, 10,393,824 in 2010, 11,310,944 in 2011, 10,853,400 in 2012, 10883282 in 2013, 11,025,994 in 20014 and 11,607,561 in 2015, this shows that there has been tremendous increase in allocation of financial resources per school since FPE begun in 2003. The study findings agrees with Sifuna, Chimombo, Ampiah, Byamugisha and Yamada (2009) who argued that provision of instructional materials

including text books was identified as one key achievement of the FPE programmes, particularly through reducing the cost burden of education.

There were 200,649 class rooms in 2003 when FPE begun, 205,543 in 2004, 177,213 in 2005, 200,821 in 2006, 210,680 in 2007, 220,111 in 2008, 220, 950 in 2009, 240,114 in 2010, 250, 382 in 2011, 260, 549 in 2012, 280, 026 in in 2013, 280, 362 in 2014 and 290,460 in 2015, these shows that the government had made efforts to increase the number of class rooms for free primary education. The table shows text book to pupil’s ratio was 1:4 in 2003, 1:3 in 2004, 1:5 in 2005, 1:4 in 2006, 1:3 in 2007, 1:4 in 2008, 1:4 in 2009, 1:4 in 2010, 1:5 in 2011, 1:6 in 2012, 1:5 in 2013, 1:4 in 2014 and 1:5 in 2015, this shows that the text book to pupil ratio was still very low. The mean financial allocation was 138197.2231 and standard deviation of 92815.53585. When free primary education was introduced, the high enrolment resulted to inadequate learning materials which led to poor academic performance. The government has not done enough to improve the allocation of learning materials. The study findings agrees with Sifuna et al., (2009) who argued that learning materials, especially books, were not appropriate in schools. Teachers prepare curriculum documents, but most of them do not regularly use teaching aids.

Table 6. Learning Resources

Table 7 shows summary on academic performance

Year	Financial allocation in kshs Billions	Number of Schools	Mean financial allocation per school in Kshs	Text Book Pupil’s Ratio
2003	98,700,000,000	17,500	5,640,000	1:4
2004	109,381, 900,000	17,855	6,126,121.5	1:3
2005	113,987,300,000	17,999	6,332,979.6	1:5
2006	118, 800,000,000	18,124	6,554,844.4	1:4
2007	122,869,000,000	18,361	6,691,846.8	1:3
2008	139, 879,800,000	18,491	7,564,750.4	1:4
2009	154,405, 400,000	18,543	8326883.5	1:4
2010	198, 095, 900,000	19,059	10,393,824	1:4
2011	213, 200,000,000	18,849	11,310,944	1:5

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

2012	220,400,000,000	20,307	10,853,400	1:6
2013	230,780,000,000	21,205	10883282	1:5
2014	234,567,000,000	21,274	11,025,994	1:4
2015	256,678,000,000	22,113	11,607,561	1:5
Mean financial allocation per year	138197.2231			
Standard deviation	92815.53585			

Respondents agreed that schools recorded good performance since the introduction of FPE as evidenced by (M=4.0278 SD=0.73625), this shows that there was improvement in academic performance since the introduction of FPE. Respondents agreed that resources allocated have helped improve learning as evidenced by (M=3.7778 SD=0.76012), this shows that there has been significance improvement on resources allocated to schools. The study findings agrees with Voss et al., (2004) who argued that the allocation of resources

influenced the implementation of the FPE as the amount allocated to child by the government was not adequate. Respondents agreed that there has been an improvement in how teachers delivered to pupils as evidenced by (M=3.9167 SD=0.80623), this shows that the government has provided new ways of teaching. Respondents agreed that there has been an improvement on the number of pupils graduating to high schools as evidenced by (M=3.9167 SD=0.69179), this shows that the number of pupils has increased since introduction of FPE

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics on Academic Performance

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Schools recorded good performance since the introduction of FPE	36	4.0278	.73625
Resources allocated have helped improve learning	36	3.7778	.76012
There has been an improvement in how teachers delivered to pupils	36	3.9167	.80623
There has been an improvement on the number of pupils graduating to high schools	36	3.9167	.69179

Table 8. Academic Performance of Pupils

Year	Average Score in Public Schools out of 500 marks	Percentage score in public schools	score Average in Private schools out of 500 marks	Percentage score in private schools
2003	243	48.6%	297	59.4%
2004	243	48.6%	297	59.4%
2005	243	48.6%	290	58%
2006	245	49%	288	57.6%
2007	244	48.8%	291	58.2%
2008	244	48.8%	291	58.2%
2009	246	49.2%	270	54%
2010	246	49.2%	270	54%
2011	247	49.4%	277	55.4%
2012	240	48%	280	56%
2013	244	48.8%	289	57.8%
2014	250	50%	291	58.2%
2015	249	49.8%	288	57.6%
Total mean score	207.31		270.69	

Tested its significance and established the cause-and-effect relation between independent and dependent variables

Table 9. Correlations for Primary Data

		ENRILMENT OF PUPILS	UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES	QUALITY OF TEACHING	PERFOMANCE
ENRILMENT OF PUPILS	Pearson Correlation	1	.031	.235	.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.858	.168	.702
	N	36	36	36	36
UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES	Pearson Correlation	.031	1	-.004	.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.858		.980	.560
	N	36	36	36	36
QUALITY OF TEACHING	Pearson Correlation	.235	-.004	1	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.168	.980		.929
	N	36	36	36	36
PERFOMANCE	Pearson Correlation	.066	-.101	-.015	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.702	.560	.929	
	N	36	36	36	36

Table 9 shows a positive and weak relationship between pupil’s enrolment and average score in public primary schools. The relationships significant ($r = 0.066, p < 0.05$) thus pupils enrolment affect academic performance in public primary schools. The table shows a positive and weak relationship between quality of teaching and academic performance. The relationship was significant at ($r = 0.702, p < 0.05$), thus quality of teaching affect performance in public

primary schools. The table also shows a positive and weak relationship between financial allocation and academic performance. The relationship is significant at ($r = 0.101, p < 0.05$), thus financial allocation greatly affected academic performance in public primary schools. The table also shows a positive relationship between numbers of class rooms and academic performance. The relationship is significant at ($r = 0.015, p < 0.05$), thus number of classrooms greatly affect academic performance in public primary schools.

Table 10. Correlations

		Pupils Enrolment	Quality of Teaching	Financial Allocation	Number of Class rooms	Academic performance
Pupils Enrolment	Pearson	1	.181	.648*	.898**	.393
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.553	.017	.000	.184
Quality of Teaching	N	13	13	13	13	13
	Pearson	.181	1	.312	.452	.074
	Correlation					
Financial Allocation	Sig. (2-tailed)	.553		.299	.121	.809
	N	13	13	13	13	13
	Pearson	.648*	.312	1	.734**	.292
Number of Class rooms	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.299		.004	.332
	N	13	13	13	13	13
Academic performance	Pearson	.898**	.452	.734**	1	.497
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.121	.004		.084
	N	13	13	13	13	13
	Pearson	.393	.074	.292	.497	1
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.184	.809	.332	.084	
	N	13	13	13	13	13

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 10 shows a positive and weak relationship between pupil’s enrolment and average score in public primary schools. The

relationships significant ($r = 0.393, p < 0.05$) thus pupils enrolment affect academic performance in public primary schools. The table

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

shows a positive and weak relationship between quality of teaching and academic performance. The relationship was significant at ($r = 0.074$, $p < 0.05$), thus quality of teaching affect performance in public primary schools. The table also shows a positive and weak relationship between financial allocation and academic performance. The relationship is significant at ($r = 0.332$, $p < 0.05$), thus financial allocation greatly affected academic performance in public primary schools. The table also shows a positive relationship

between number of class rooms and academic performance. The relationship is significant at ($r = 0.084$, $p < 0.05$), thus number of classrooms greatly affect academic performance in public primary schools.

Table 4.15 below presents the results of regression analysis model relating to pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching, leaning resources and academic performance.

Table 4.11 Model Summary for Primary Data

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.126 ^a	.016	-.076	.36759

a. Predictors: (Constant), QUALITY OF TEACHING, UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES, ENRILMENT OF PUPILS

Table 4.11 above shows the R-value of 0.016 shows a positive linear relationship between pupil’s enrolments, quality of teaching, leaning resources and academic performance. The R^2 is the coefficient of determination which indicates that explanatory power of the independent variables is 0.016.

This means that 1.6% of changes in academic performance are explained by effect of FPE (pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources). Hence, there could be other factors (not part of this study) that explain academic performance.

Table 12. Model Summary for secondary data

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.396 ^a	.157	-.124	2.85314

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learning resources, Quality of Teaching, Pupils Enrolment

In view of the results in table 12 above, the R-value of 0.396 shows a positive linear relationship between pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching, leaning resources and academic performance. The R^2 is the coefficient of determination which indicates that explanatory power of the

independent variables is 0.157. This means that 15.7% of changes in academic performance are explained by effect of FPE (pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources). Hence, there could be other factors (not part of this study) that explain academic performance.

Table 13. ANOVA For Primary Data

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.070	3	.023	.173	.914 ^b
	Residual	4.324	32	.135		
	Total	4.394	35			

a. Dependent Variable: PERFOMANCE

b. Predictors: (Constant), QUALITY OF TEACHING, UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES, ENRILMENT OF PUPILS

The results in table 13 above indicate that for pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching, and leaning resources significant effect ($p = 0.627$) on academic performance. This implies goodness of fit of

the model, thus the variables can be carried on for further analysis to determine with significance the level of its influence.

Table 14. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.616	3	4.872	.606	.627 ^b
	Residual	72.307	9	8.034		
	Total	86.923	12			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Performance

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learning Resources, Quality of Teaching, Pupils Enrolment

The results in table 14above indicate that for pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching, and leaning resources significant effect ($p = 0.627$) on academic performance. This implies goodness of fit of

the model, thus the variables can be carried on for further analysis to determine with significance the level of its influence.

Table 15. Coefficients for Primary Data

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.045	.499		8.108	.000
	ENRILMENT OF PUPILS	.037	.086	.077	.427	.672
	UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES	-.077	.131	-.103	-.587	.561
	QUALITY OF TEACHING	-.031	.163	-.034	-.188	.852

a. Dependent Variable: PERFOMANCE

The results shows that the beta coefficient of pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources was 0.037, -0.077and -0.031 which helps to generate the model $Y=4.045+0.037X_1+-0.077X_2+0.031X_3$ for pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources versus academic

performance. This model implies that every a unit increase in pupil’s enrolment leads to 0.037 increases in academic performance. An increase in quality of teaching leads to – 0.077 in academic performance. A unit increase in learning resources leads to 0.031 increase in academic performance.

Table 16. Coefficients for secondary data

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.489	53.351		4.470	.002
	Pupils Enrolment	.008	.000	.351	.873	.405
	Quality of Teaching	-.910	.000	-.011	-.033	.974
	Learning resources	0.970	.000	.068	.163	.874

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Performance

The study further determined the beta coefficients of pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching, and leaning resources. The results showed that the beta coefficient of pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources was 0.008, -0.910, 0.006 and 0.970 which helps to generate the model $Y=2.489+0.008X_1+-0.910X_2+0.006X_3+0.970X_4$ for pupil’s enrolment, quality of teaching and learning resources versus academic performance. This model implies that every a unit increase in pupil’s enrolment leads to 0.008 increases in academic performance. An increase in quality of teaching leads to –0.910 in academic performance. A unit increase in learning resources leads to 0.970 increase in academic performance.

likely to negatively affect the quality of education being offered.

4. DISCUSSION

Pupil’s enrolment had a mean of 8771139.8462 and a standard deviation of 1049054.33000 which agrees with Oketch and Somerset (2010) who argued that there were high rates of enrolment in various schools when free primary education (FPE) was introduced in Kenya. The study found out that teachers are overwhelmed with work because of the increased number of pupils in schools. This is so because when the pupils are joining school two to FPE, not enough teachers are being employed by the government to correspond with the increase. Oketch and Somerset (2010) observe that overcrowded classrooms and overburdened teachers are

The study findings agrees with a study Oyaró (2008) that aimed at understanding how pupil teacher ratio affected syllabus coverage, found that 74% of the respondent believed that high number of pupils and low number of teachers greatly affected coverage of syllabus, classroom control and thus compromising educational quality. The study further found out that the government has not made efforts to increase the wide variety of instructors to match the increasing number of pupils. The study findings agree with a study by Abdullahi (2015) who argued that understanding how pupil teacher ratio affected syllabus coverage, found that 74% of the respondent believed that high number of pupils and low number of teachers greatly affected coverage of syllabus, classroom control and thus compromising educational quality.

The findings show that there has been tremendous increase in allocation of financial resources per school since FPE begun in 2003. The text book to pupil ratio was still very low. The government has not done enough to improve the allocation of learning materials. The study findings agrees with Abdullahi (2015), who states that provision of instructional materials including text books is identified as one of key achievement of the FPE programme, particularly through reducing the cost burden of education on parents through availability of study centers or libraries in schools thus leading to one

improvement towards quality education. The mean financial allocation was 138197.2231 and standard deviation of 92815.53585. The relationship is significant at ($r = 0.332$, $p < 0.05$), thus financial allocation greatly affected academic performance in public primary schools.

Free primary education has compromised on quality. The study findings agree with study by Sifuna (2005) who argued that understanding how pupil teacher ratio affected syllabus coverage, found that 74% of the respondent believed that high number of pupils and low number of teachers greatly affected coverage of syllabus, classroom control and thus compromising educational quality. From the study findings, the continued and consistent dominance of private schools in the KCPE is quite a clear indication of the rising disparity in quality between public and private schools. The findings show that free primary education has compromised on quality. Performance at KCPE shows that most of the students making transition to top secondary schools are from private schools. This creates inequality to access of opportunities to national and top performing provincial schools. Free primary education had a negative effect on academic performance in public schools. The findings agree with Sawamura and Sifuna (2008) who asserted that the government tends to focus on the quantitative expansion of education, paying less attention to value, significance, and effects of education for individuals.

5. CONCLUSION

The introduction of FPE in 2003 by the Government of Kenya led to notable strains in the ability of primary schools to offer quality education. Based on a prime indicator of school-based factors, the study has demonstrated that the key challenges to effective curriculum implementation of FPE include: teacher inadequacy, indiscipline, and inadequacy of teaching learning resources and school facilities. These have negatively impacted on effective implementation of the curriculum using modern learner friendly instructional techniques that actively engage the learner in the entire teaching /learning process. The country's commitment to achieving UPE and EFA has thus been threatened as confirmed by the first ever Education for All (EFA) assessment in 2010 that revealed that Kenya still had challenges to quality education that included teacher shortages due to budgetary constraints with many schools reporting a PTR of more than 1:50; overcrowded classes due to inadequate infrastructure; inadequate textbook storage facilities and poor maintenance of textbooks; indiscipline due to admission of overage pupils as well as overcrowded classes and ineffective curriculum implementation resulting in low mastery of literacy and numeracy in pupil performance due to teacher absenteeism and inappropriate pedagogical skills, among others (Republic of Kenya/UNESCO, 2012) .

The challenge of implementing FPE in the country has made the achievement of some specific MDG targets in education difficult. The Republic of Kenya/UNESCO (2012) findings

tend to confirm the locating of this research that the significant inflow of pupil populace after the introduction of FPE in 2003 has exacerbated the challenges of large class sizes, pupil age variation, pupil discipline management, low teacher morale, teacher inadequacy as well as Facilities and teaching/getting to know assets. Instructors of various characteristics understand these demanding situations to have affected their effectiveness and hence the great of primary education inside the nation.

The advent of FPE has also affected the capacity of current coaching force. The specific facets of teacher effectiveness that the initiative apparently jeopardized include teaching methodology, pupil discipline control, and management of examinations and effective use of teaching and gaining knowledge of resources. The teachers have seemingly lost the capacity for effective pupil engagement, which is instrumental in improving teacher effectiveness. Within the FPE set-up efficient teaching workforce satisfaction has not been conducive; thereby diminishing the instruments to reward motivate the teachers. Specific challenges that significantly affect teacher effectiveness include large class size, teacher inadequacies and pupil age variation.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

From findings of the study the following recommendations are made;

That there should be clear enrolment criteria for pupils in standard one. This should bear in mind age factor in admission so as to avoid over age pupils or adults enrolling with young pupils. The government should put up additional modern physical infrastructures such as classrooms, toilet facilities, and libraries to meet the needs of more pupils enrolled in schools. Such facilities school should be according to set standards and benchmarks.

The Government should allocate sufficient financial resources to purchase adequate and recommended instructional materials such as text books and other teaching aids. The funds allocated should cater for each pupil academic requirements in each school. The funds should be released on timely basis to facilitate appropriate planning by school managements. Public primary schools should adhere to the UNESCO pupil teacher ratio of 1:40 in all schools. The government needs to recruit more qualified teachers to meet the short falls study by the study. The teachers should be well remunerated to sustain their motivation. Meanwhile, staff rationalization may be done by transferring teachers from schools with more teachers to those with extreme shortages. The study recommends appropriate pupil classroom ratio of 1:40 to avoid overcrowding and congestion in classrooms. The standards of the classroom size should be as per approval by the Ministry of education. The classrooms should be made up of permanent structures with appropriate ventilations to create a favorable learning environment for pupils. Parents

should be encouraged to take more proactive roles in matters regarding their children education

REFERENCES

1. Abbey R. (2003) the Introduction of Free Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 37 (3), 1-7.
2. Achoka, J. (2007), Access to basic education in Kenya: inherent concerns, *Educational Research and Review* Vol. 2 (10), pp. 275-284,
3. Aduda D. (2005) *Future of Education*. New York, USA, McGraw-Hill
4. Ashioya, L. and Maiyo. J. (2009) *Poverty Alleviation* Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
5. Backer, D (1975). *Interstellar scattering of pulsar radiation. I-Scintillation*. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 9 (4) 122-138
6. Bold, T., Kimenyi, M., Mwabu, G., and Sandefur, J. (2010) *Free Primary Education in Kenya: Enrolment, Achievement and Accountability*. Nairobi, Kenya, accelerated actors.
7. Boy J. (2005) *Free Primary Education and its Effects on Student Performance in Bungoma District*. Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
8. Chuck A. (2009) *Disparities in the System: The Effects of Free Primary Education (FPE) on the quality of Education in Nairobi's Public Schools*. Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
9. DFID. (2013). *Education for pupils with disabilities - improving access and quality*. London, United Kingdom, Pearson Publisher.
10. Evers, W Tomic, W. and Brouwers, A. (2004) *Burnout among teachers*. *School Psychology International*, 7 (3) 281-298
11. Fafunwa, A. (1974) *History of Education in Nigeria* ; London: United Kingdom, George Allen & Unwin
12. Fleshman, F. (2005). *Giant step for Kenya, s schools*. *Africa Renewal*, 4 (4) 495-505.
13. Glennerster. R. (2011), *Access and Quality in the Kenyan Education System*: Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
14. Itunga, A (2011) *The Threat to Free Primary Education in Kenya*. Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
15. Jabareen, Y. (2009) *Building a Conceptual Framework: Philosophy, Definitions, and Procedure*. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*. 10 (5), 61-67.
16. Kenny C (2014), *the Global Expansion of Primary Education* London, United Kingdom, Pearson Publisher
17. Klaus D (2003), *does cost of schooling affect enrollment by the poor? Universal primary education in Uganda*, *Economics of Education Review* 31 (4) 398-412
18. Kombo M.N & Tromp P.H (2006), *Research Methods*, New York, USA, McGraw-Hill
19. McGaghie P, William C. Bordage N, Georges S, Shea and Judy A. (2001). *Problem Statement, Conceptual Framework, and Research Question*. *Academic Medicine*: 31 (3), 25-32
20. Ministry of Education (2009), *the National Special Needs Education Policy Framework*, Nairobi, Kenya, Government press
21. Ministry of Education. (2016). *EMIS Education Facts and Figures*. Nairobi, Kenya, Government press
22. Ngugi M. N.(2003) *Impact of Assessment of Universal Primary Education (UPE) Policy* Nairobi, Kenya, Government press
23. Nkinyangi, S. (2005). *Taita Taveta District Challenges of Implementing Free Primary Education*. Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
24. Ogola O.F. (2010), *Free Education in Kenya's Public Primary Schools, Addressing the Challenges*, Nairobi, Kenya, accelerated actors.
25. Okatch, B Pamela A, (2011), *Mechanisms and effects of special education financing policy in Kenya*, Nairobi, Kenya, accelerated actors.
26. Oketch M. and Somerset, A (2010) *'Free Primary Education and After in Kenya: Enrolment impact, quality effects, and the transition to secondary school'*, *Create Pathways to Access, Research Monograph* (22), 106-114.
27. Oketch, M. O. and Rolleston, L. (2007) *Policies of Free Primary and Secondary Education in East Africa: A Review of the Literature*. Ed. Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity. *Research Monograph*(7), 454-468.
28. Oyaró, K (2008) *Free Secondary Schooling Policy Faces Testing times*. New York, USA, McGraw-Hill.
29. Sang, A. and Kipsoi, E. (2005). *Primary school performance within the public and private sectors*: London, United Kingdom, Pearson Publisher
30. Sawamura. N, Sifuna. D. N, (2008), *Universalizing Primary Education in Kenya: Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 2, (2) 16-21.
31. Sifuna D. Chimombo, J. Ampiah, J. Byamugisha, A. and Yamada S. A. (2009). *Comparative Analysis of Universal Primary Education Policy in Ghana, Kenya, Malawi ad Uganda* CICE Hiroshima University. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education* 50, (2) 368-425.
32. Sifuna, D. (2005). *The illusion of universal free primary education in Kenya*. *Wajibu: Journal of Social and Religious Concern* 81 (3) 286-298.
33. Too, J .K. (2005) *Quality of free primary Education in Kenya.*, Eldoret, Kenya, Moi University Press.
34. UNESCO (2000). *The Dakar Framework of Action*. Paris: UNESCO
35. UNESCO (2005). *Challenges of Implementing Free Primary Education in Kenya; Assessment Report*.
36. UNESCO (2005) *Challenges of implementing free primary education in Kenya. (Assessment Report)*. Nairobi: UNESCO, 2005.
37. Voss, R.; Bedi, A.; Kimalu, ; Manda, D.; Nafula, N; Kimenyi, M.(2004) *Achieving universal primary education* London, United Kingdom, Pearson Publisher
38. Vreede E. (2003). *Free primary school education in Kenya: what does it mean for hygiene and sanitation in schools* Nairobi, Kenya, accelerated actors.
39. Wax E., (2003) *Too many brains pack Kenya's free schools*. New York, USA, McGraw-Hill

“The Influence of Free Primary Education Programme on Pupils Performance in Kenya”

40. Yieke Felicia A (2006). Free Primary Education (FPE) in Kenya: London, United Kingdom: Pitman
41. Yieke, F. A. (2006) Free Primary Education (FPE) in Kenya; Nairobi, Kenya, ACTS Publishers.
42. Zikmund, W., (2010). Business Research Methods 8th Edition. McGraw-Hill Publishers. U.S.A. New York.