# Household Level on Retention: Focus on Opportunities in Kenya Public University Education

Erastus Muchimuti & Alice Limo (PhD)
*School of Education, University of Eldoret, P.O Box 2500, Eldoret, Kenya*

***Abstract:-*** **The major dynamic of university education is to develop the people, society and the economy which are central to most National mission and visions. This study sought to investigate the effects of household levels on retention to public university education in Kenya. This study was modeled on the education production theory. The study used a case study research design. The research targeted a total of 1219 respondents including. The sample size of the study was calculated using the formula below as recommended by Fisher *et al*. The desired sample size was therefore comprised of 292 respondents. Purposive sampling and simple random sampling technique was used in choosing the sample size. The research instruments used to collect data were questionnaire for University students. Interview schedules were administered to deputy vice chancellor, heads of departments, dean of students and. The questioner was made up of open ended and closed ended items. Data collected was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The findings of the study were found to be significant and benefit in the streamlining of Retention of public university in Kenya. The study findings indicated that there was a significant relationship between household levels on Retention to education. The study concluded that farming activities determine access to public university education. The rapid expansion of university education has strained the existing facilities and adversely affected the quality of learning. There are funds provided by government for expansion to cater for high enrolment.**

***Key words:*** **Household level, Retention, Opportunities, University Education**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Carpenter and Hayden (2013), three conceptual approaches can be identified to capture the potential empirical knowledge about the determinants of access and retention to tertiary education: economical models, sociological models and psychological models. From an economic point of view, decisions to pursue higher education; are influenced by perceived returns on the investment in tertiary education qualifications. The demand for higher education increase when the private rate of return to education is greater than return from other investment opportunities. There are numerous studies analyzing the demand for university education with this approach (Salas-Velasco 2010).

Salas-Velasco (2010) argues the need to consider the consumption motive, as well as employment perspective, in the education demand model. Most economic research based on personal characteristics shows the importance of family background factors. It has been widely reported that the education level of parents and to a lesser extent family income, has a strong influence on the demand for higher education (Albert 2010). Moreover, parental level of education is related to the student's choice of the type and lengths of his/her higher education (Budria 2016) families invest in students' education, but are constrained by economic and educational resource of families. They invest if they have resources to spend.

Individual characteristics such as academic ability have reported to have a strong influence. As a psychological/individual factor, student ability is commonly investigated and is often a major determinant of the student's educational aspiration. Student perceptions and attitudes towards higher education and work are shown to be importance. According to Becker (1985) demographic variables such as sex, race and ethnic origin can also impact the decision to enter higher education. Family background is also significant. The main focus of this approach is the relationship between the social origins students such as means of home, family Structure, ethnicity, region, peer group, aspiration and the ability with achievement and entry to higher education.

The importance of the cultural and familial environment in early studenthood on later education is also argued, which reinforces the relevance of family characteristics to predict the students' future. When the chronological evolution of the influence of family background is analyzed, its impact on students' educational attainment is attainment is relatively low due to the extension of compulsory education and mass higher education (Carpenter and Hayden, 2013), or due to the increase of individualization and the decline of ascription within some social changes. When variables related to socio economic status of the neighborhood are examined, the educational levels of the region where students live influence the demand for higher education.

### *1.1 Statement of the problem*

The Commission for university education (CUE) which regulates university education in terms of standards has set merit, carrying capacity, catchment areas and quota for educationally disadvantaged region and genders as criteria for admission into public universities. It has been argued that rather than enhance access to university education, thousands of applicants sit for the Kenya certificate of secondary

education (KCSE) examinations and less than ten percent (10%) on the average gain admission into the public universities. It becomes apparent for the researcher to investigate into household levels, physical facilities, human resources and government support mechanism to establish the extent to which they are determinants of Retention to public university education in Kenya.

*1.2 Objective of the study*

To establish the effect of household level on Retention to public university education in Kenya

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

Research design is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted. It constitutes the blue print for the collection, measurement and analysis of data(Kothari 2008).The case study design method seeks to describe a unit in detail, in context and holistically. It is a way of organizing educational data and looking at the objective to be studied as a whole. In a case study, a great deal can be learned from a few examples of the phenomena under study (Kombo and Tromp, 2009). A case study of University of Eldoret allowed an in depth insight and better understanding of the determinants of Retention to public university education in Kenya.

*2.1 Ethical considerations*

To ensure that the study complies with the ethical issues pertaining research undertaking, a permission to conduct the research was sought from the respective authorities. A full disclosure of all the activities concerning the study was explained to the authorities and this involved the study intention which was only for learning purposes. A high level of confidentiality and privacy was observed and the findings of the study were only submitted to the university. A letter of introduction was obtained from the University to serve as evidence of the purpose of the study. In respect for the informants and in order to protect them from abuse resulting from the data they give for the research, data was presented in such a way that it was not linked to individuals who gave it except by the researcher who might have needed to seek clarification during analysis of data.

## III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to establish the effect of household level on Retention to public university education in Kenya, a case study of University of Eldoret. The study findings were as shown in table 3.1.

*3.1Household level on Retention to education*

The study sought to determine the influence of household level on level of Retention to education in University of Eldoret. The study responses were as in table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Household level on Retention to education

| Statements | | SD | D | U | A | SA | Total | Mean | StdDev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farming activities determine retention to public university education | F | 0 | 0 | 30 | 74 | 174 | 278 | 4.52 | -1.165 |
| | % | 0 | 0 | 10.8 | 26.6 | 62.6 | 100 | 90.4 | |
| Business activities determine retention to public university education | F | 0 | 0 | 30 | 74 | 174 | 278 | 4.51 | -0.275 |
| | % | 0 | 0 | 10.8 | 26.6 | 62.6 | 100 | 90.2 | |
| Family physical infrastructure determine retention to public university education | F | 0 | 0 | 30 | 82 | 166 | 278 | 4.48 | -0.45 |
| | % | 0 | 0 | 10.8 | 29.5 | 59.7 | 100 | 89.6 | |
| Family number of students determines retention to public university education | F | 0 | 1 | 24 | 773 | 118 | 278 | 4.28 | -0.273 |
| | % | 0 | 2.9 | 8.6 | 278 | 42.4 | 100 | 85.6 | |
| Religion support determine retention to public university education | F | 0 | 0 | 34 | 94 | 150 | 278 | 4.42 | -0.905 |
| | % | 0 | 0 | 12.2 | 33.8 | 54 | 100 | 88.4 | |

From the above results, the standard deviation results show that the data was within a considerable range of between -2 and +2 implying that the data proved normal univariate distribution.

The study results on the influence of household level on level of Retention to education indicated that 90.4% (mean=4.52) were of the opinion that business activities determine access to public university education, 90.2% (mean=4.51) were of the opinion that parents in their school have high income, 89.6% (mean = 4.48) were of the opinion that physical infrastructure determine retention to public university education, 85.6% (mean = 4.28) were of the opinion that family number of students determines access to public university education while 88.4% (mean=4.42) were of the opinion that religion determine access to public university education.

The study results revealed that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that farming activities determine access to

public university education. This implies that farming activities enable the parents/guardians to generate income to pay for their students in university. These findings were supported by Sean (2013) who presented in his comprehensive study how students from families with high income are having best performance than those from low income families. His study took place in United States of America. He posited that the impact of the parents' income can be shown in the early timing of the students' learning. He maintained that parents of higher income take their students to school earlier than their lower income counterparts. They can afford to take their students through school learning and this have greater impact in their later educational outcomes since it provides them with the required cognitive and social development. This is unlike their low income counterparts who do not afford preschool learning for their students and prefer having their students commence learning from class one (grade one) onwards.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that farming activities determine access to public university education. Farming activities enable the parents/guardians to generate income to pay for their students in university. The rapid expansion of university education has strained the existing facilities and adversely affected the quality of learning. Public universities do not have satisfactory number and quality of computers for effective teaching and learning and that lack of enough physical facilities such as lecture rooms, computers, laboratories and laboratory and workshop equipment negatively affected the quality of teaching and learning in public universities.

## V. WAY FORWARD

The findings and recommendations from this study will go a long way in helping Commission of university Education to Review and streamline public universities Education in Kenya and come up with appropriate strategies on the Policy on student access and retention on public university education in Kenya. The study also enriched the Literature on ways of attaining access and retention at university education in Kenya.Finally, Education and development of human resources are considered one of the major strategies for positive adaptation to changing conditions and an institutional competitive advantage. The effectiveness of an institution is largely dependent on the level of knowledge and skills of its employees and higher levels of institutional knowledge leads to higher levels of adaption to the changing conditions of student access and retention in these institutions.

## REFERENCES


[1]. Albert, A. (2010). Women, lifelong learning, and transitions into employment. Work, Employment, and Society, 20, 309–328.

[2]. Becker, S. A. *NMC horizon report: 1985 higher education edition* (pp. 1-60). The New Media Consortium.

[3]. Budría, S., & Moro-Egido, A. I. (2016).Overeducation and wages in Europe: Evidence from quantile regression. *EstudiosSobre La Economía Española*, *229*, 509-531.

[4]. Carpenter, B.& Hayden M. (2013). Funding patterns and their effects on quality of higher education in Kenya.In *Kenyatta University.Conference paper. Nairobi*.

[5]. Kombo, D. K., & Tromp, D. L. (2009). Introduction to proposal writing. *Nairobi: Pauline publications*.

[6]. Kothari, C.R (2008*). Research methodology: methods and technique*: New Delhi: New age international publishers 2nd revised edition

[7]. Salas, K. C., &Velasco, W. (2010). The human core of the shared socioeconomic pathways: Population scenarios by age, sex and level of education for all countries to 2100. *Global Environmental Change, 42*, 181-192.

[8]. Sean, T. (2013). Family assets, postsecondary education, and students with disabilities: Building on progress and overcoming challenges. *Studentren and Youth Services Review*, *35*(7), 1078-1086.