

**INFLUENCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES ON STUDENTS' ACADEMIC
PERFORMANCE IN SCIENCE SUBJECTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN
KAKAMEGA SOUTH SUB-COUNTY, KENYA**

BY

IDAVALE BENJAMIN MISIGO

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF EDUCATION IN PLANNING AND
ECONOMICS IN EDUCATION**

©MASENO UNIVERSITY

©2019

DECLARATION

STUDENT

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented to any other university for a Masters degree in Planning and Economics in Education.

Sign.....Date.....

Idavale Benjamin Misigo PG/MED/0077/2012

This thesis has been submitted for examination with our approval as university supervisors.

Sign..... Date.....

Prof. Maureen Olel

Department of Educational Management and Foundations

Maseno University

Sign..... Date.....

Dr. James Sika

Department of Educational Management and Foundations

Maseno University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to God. I thank the many people who in one way or another assisted me during the course of my study.

I am greatly indebted to my supervisors: Prof. Maureen Olel and Dr. James Sika and the whole Department of Educational Management and Foundations for their professional guidance and moral support in the course of this study. I am equally very grateful to my friends Norich Munyasia, Titus Masheti and Edward Kubai for their encouragement and help during our period of study. God bless them.

My gratitude goes to my son Gift Misigo and my daughter Dahlia Mimo for their love, care and encouragement. Thanks for allowing me time out of my parenting responsibilities to achieve this. I love you.

Lastly, am grateful to my friends for the encouragement, advice and support rendered during the whole period we have been studying. Thanks and God bless you.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated with love to my two beloved little children; Gift Misigo and Dahlia Mimo.

ABSTRACT

Adequate academic resources are necessary for high performance in science subjects. In Kakamega South Sub-County secondary schools students' low performance in science subjects was below 6.00 by 2014 KCSE. The sub-county posted lower means in science subjects compared to neighbouring sub-counties; averagely, 2012 to 2014; Mumias posted 5.539, Kakamega Central 4.940 and Kakamega South 4.071. Also the sub-county was posting an average negative deviation (-0.566) in comparison to the average Kakamega County mean in the three science subjects between 2012-2014. The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of educational resources on students' academic performance in science subjects in secondary schools in Kakamega South Sub-County. The objectives were; to determine the influence of educational physical, educational human and educational financial resources on students' academic performance in science subjects. A theoretical framework based on Psachoropoulos and Woodhall's Education Production theory, was used; inputs were educational physical, human and financial resources, while the output was the students' academic performance in science subjects. The study was guided by descriptive and correlation designs. The study population was 2,196 students, 24 principals, 24 H.O.Ds from 24 secondary schools and 1 SQASO. Saturated sampling was used to select 1 SQASO, 24 principals, 24 HODs while 658 students were sampled. The sampled respondents made the unit of analysis. Pilot study included 3 schools, 3 principals, 3 H.O.Ds and 66 students. Data collection instruments were questionnaire, interview schedule, documents analysis and observation schedule. Face and content validity of instruments was determined by two supervisors in the Department of Educational Management and Foundations at Maseno University. Reliability of the instruments was determined through test re-test method. Reliability coefficient of H.o.Ds' questionnaire was .83, principals' .87 and students' .75. The reliability coefficient was set at .70. Quantitative data was analyzed using percentages, frequency counts and means. Regression analysis was used. Results showed that $r^2 = 0.245$ translating to 24.50% of students' academic performance in science subjects can be explained by educational human resources while $r^2=0.714$ which is 71.40% by educational physical resources and $r^2=0.224$ which is 22.40% by educational financial resources. The relationship between educational physical, human and financial resources and students' academic performance in science subjects was at $r=0.845$; $p=0.000$, $r=0.495$; $p=0.000$ and $r=0.420$; $p=0.000$ respectively thus null hypotheses rejected. Qualitative data was categorized and reported in emergent themes. It was recommended that more finances be provided, more practicals lessons be schedule and current equipment provided for students' better experience in practicals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgement.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Table of contents.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	x
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Figures.....	xiii
Abbreviation and Acronyms.....	xiv

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	10
1.3 Purpose of the study.....	11
1.4 Specific objectives.....	12
1.5 Research hypotheses.....	12
1.6 Significance of the study.....	13
1.7 Assumption of the study.....	13
1.8 Theoretical framework.....	13
1.9 Limitation to the study.....	14
1.10 Scope of the study.....	14
1.11 Definition of key operational terms.....	15

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	17
2.2 Physical resources.....	17
2.2.1 Science equipment.....	17
2.2.2 Laboratory working space.....	18
2.3 Human resources.....	20
2.3.1 Science teacher’s lesson load.....	20
2.3.2 Number of practical lessons per week.....	21
2.3.3 Student-science teacher ratio.....	22
2.3.4 Science teacher qualification.....	24
2.4 Financial resources.....	25
2.3.1 Cost of practicals.....	25

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....	27
3.2 Research design.....	27
3.3 Area of study.....	27
3.4 Study population.....	28
3.5 Sample size and sampling procedure.....	28
3.6 Instruments of data collection.....	28 3.6.1
Student’s questionnaire.....	29
3.6.2 Science head of department’s questionnaire.....	29
3.6.3 Principal’s questionnaire.....	29
3.6.4 Quality and Standards Assurance Officer’s questionnaire.....	29
3.6.5 Science Head of Department Interview Schedule.....	30

3.6.6 Observation schedule.....	30
3.6.7 Documents analysis.....	30
3.7 Validity of the research instrument.....	30
3.8 Reliability of research instrument.....	30
3.9 Data collection procedure.....	31
3.10 Methods for data analysis.....	31
3.11 Ethical considerations.....	32
3.12 Analytical tools.....	33

**CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS, DATA ANALYSIS AND
DISCUSSIONS**

4.1 Introduction.....	34
4.2 Demographic characteristics of schools, students, science H.O.Ds and principals in 2015.....	35
4.3 Influence of Educational Physical Resources on student’s academic performance in science subjects.....	40
4.5 Influence of Human Resources on student’s academic performance in science subjects.....	50
4.6 Influence of Educational Financial Resources and student academic performance in Science Subjects.....	59

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMANDATIONS

5.1 Introduction.....	63
5.2 Summary of the study.....	63
5.2.1 Influence of Educational Physical Resources on student’s academic performance in science subjects.....	63

5.2.2 Influence of Educational Human Resources on student’s academic performance in science subjects.....	63
5.2.3 Influence of Educational Financial Resources on student’s academic performance in science subjects.....	64
5.3 Conclusion.....	64
5.4 Recommendations.....	65
5.5 Suggestion for further research.....	65
REFERENCES.....	67

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I: Student's questionnaire.....	72
Appendix II: Science head of department's questionnaire.....	73
Appendix III: The principal's questionnaire.....	77
Appendix IV: Quality and Standard Assurance Officer's questionnaire.....	78
Appendix V: Science Head of Department interview schedule.....	79
Appendix VI: Observation schedule.....	80
Appendix VII: Document Analysis.....	82
Appendix IX: A Sketch Map of Kakamega South Sub County.....	83
Appendix X: Science Equipment.....	84
Appendix XI: Science teachers' lesson load.....	85
Appendix XII: Practical lessons per week.....	86
Appendix XIII: Teacher Academic Qualification.....	87
Appendix XIV: Biology laboratory working space.....	88
Appendix XV: Physics laboratory working space.....	89
Appendix XVI: Chemistry laboratory working space.....	90
Appendix XVII: Cost of practicals.....	91
Appendix XIX Student-Science teacher ratio.....	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 General KCSE Performance; Comparative Analysis of Kakamega South Sub-County and Kakamega County 2012-2018.....	8
Table 1.2: Comparative Analysis of Sub-Counties Science Subjects Performance in Kakamega County 2012-2014.....	9
Table 3.1: Summary of Statistical Analytical Tools.....	33
Table 4.1: Response rate.....	35
Table 4.2: Categories of Schools under study.....	35
Table 4.3: Student subject combination and gender.....	36
Table 4.4: Students' descriptive statistics on the influence of educational resources on student's academic performance in science subjects.....	36
Table 4.5: H.O.Ds' perceptions on the influence of educational resources on student's academic performance in science subjects.....	37
Table 4.6: Principals' perceptions on the influence of educational resources on student's academic performance in science subjects.....	38
Table 4.7: Quality Assurance and Standards Officer perceptions on the influence of educational resources on student's academic performance in science subjects.....	39
Table 4.8: Correlation results of Educational Physical Resources and student academic performance.....	47
Table 4.9: Teacher-Student Ratio and students' academic Performance in Science Subjects.....	52

Table 4.10: Correlation results of Educational Human Resources and student academic performance.....55

Table 4.11: Correlational results of Educational Financial Resources and Student academic performance60

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure 4.1: Science equipment and student average performance in Science.....	41
Figure 4.2: laboratory space and students' performance in Biology.....	43
Figure 4.3: Laboratory space and student's performance in Physics.....	44
Figure 4.4: Laboratory space and student performance in Chemistry.....	45
Figure 4.5: Teacher lesson load and students' academic achievement in science subjects.....	50
Figure 4.6: Number of practical lessons per week and students' academic performance in Science subjects.....	51
Figure 4.7: Teacher academic level and students' academic achievement in science subjects.....	54
Figure 4.8: Cost of Practicals and student's academic achievement in science subjects.....	59

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Bio: Biology

BS 3202: British Standards 320

Chem: Chemistry

H.O.Ds: Heads of Departments

IOP: Institute Of Physics

KCPE: Kenya Certificate of Primary Education

KCSE: Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education

KNEC: Kenya National Examination Council

LV: Low Voltage

Phy: Physics

SCORE: Science Community Representing Education

SQASO: Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer

SSCE: Senior Secondary Certificate Examination