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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of government policies on refugee access to Primary Education, in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County. Specifically the study examined how free primary education, policy on examination registration and policy on recognition of foreign education affected access to primary education by refugee pupils. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The target population for this study comprised of 17 head teachers from public primary schools with refugee children, 351 teachers from the schools and 3,500 pupils from public primary schools in Kamukunji District. Using The Central Limit Theorem, the researcher sampled 5 primary schools, of targeted 17 schools. 7 head teachers, 40 teachers and 351 refugee pupils were sampled for the study, this was 11.5% of the target population. The study utilized questionnaires for head teachers, teachers and refugee pupil. Cronbach’s Alpha method was used to estimate the reliability of the questionnaires. A correlation coefficient of 0.74 was obtained for the teacher’s questionnaires and 0.72 for head teachers and 0.71 for pupils questionnaires. Data from the field was collected, cleaned, coded and recorded. The responses to the items in the instruments were cleaned and assigned codes and labels. Frequency counts of the responses were then obtained to generate descriptive information about the respondents and to illustrate the general trend of findings on the various variables that were under investigation. The collected data was analyzed qualitatively along the specific objectives and the basic quantitative data was analyzed using percentages. The findings of the study were presented using tables and charts since summarized large quantities of data whilst making the report reader friendly. The study established that FPE policy guidelines were not clear on the refugees’ pupils, education policies did not adequately cover the refugees’ children and that most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are in Kenya without proper documentation. It also established that the refugees’ pupils have undergone a different education system than the Kenyan education system and therefore, the certification system of the country of origin is totally different. It was found to be difficult to establish exactly the level a child was, before he or she left school and that language barriers hinder education and learning opportunities to the refugees. The study recommends that the government should formulate policies improve FPE to allow easy access of education by refugee pupils, make examination policy more flexible for refugee pupils and recognize foreign documentation such as academic reports and mark sheets for easy transfer.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Education is increasingly viewed as the 4th pillar of humanitarian response, alongside the pillars of food, shelter and health services (Midttun, 2000). Children of refugees are vulnerable and dependent, and they are developing, not only physically but mentally and emotionally. The abrupt violent onset of emergencies, the disruption of families and community structures deeply affect their physical and psychological wellbeing (UNHCR, 1994). Education provides opportunities for pupils, their families and communities to begin the trauma healing process, and to learn the skills and values needed for a more peaceful future and better governance at local and national levels. International law defines a refugee as “a person who has fled from and/or cannot return to their country due to a well-founded fear of persecution, including war or civil conflict” (UNHCR, 2003).

Under Article 1 of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees the term refugee is defined as a person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country (UNHCR, 2003). According to UNESCO (1999), an emergency in education is a crisis situation created by conflicts or disasters which have destabilized, disorganized or destroyed the education system, and which require an integrated process of crisis and
post-crisis response. For UNICEF emergencies include natural disasters such as floods and earthquakes, and human-made crises such as civil strife and war, as well as silent emergencies such as HIV/AIDS, extreme poverty and children living in the streets (Pigozzi, 1999). UNHCR estimates that there are around 8.4 million refugees and as many as 23.7 million Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs) in the world today (UNHCR, 2006). This means that over 30 million people do not have a nation state to represent them, or to provide basic human services like health and education. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26, declares that everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit (UN, 1948) The 1951 Charter also deals with education in Article 22 and states:

i. The Contracting States shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education.

ii. The Contracting States shall accord to refugees treatment as favorable as possible, and, in any event, not less favorable than that accorded to aliens generally in the same circumstances, with respect to education other than elementary education and, in particular, as regards access to studies, the recognition of foreign school certificates, diplomas and degrees, the remission of fees and charges and the award of scholarships (UNHCR, 2006).
Refugees residing outside of the camps, like those in Kamukunji District, exist within a protection gap and hold a legally ambiguous status whereby they are entitled to little protection or assistance in Nairobi and regularly have to travel back to the camps for population counts and registration with UNHCR (Campbell, 2005). UNHCR Protection Officers in Nairobi argued that there are many discrepancies in the policies that govern the rights of refugees, especially when it comes to which rights are being guaranteed in Nairobi. Regardless, many have opted out of the official encampment policy, and as a result, there is a large and growing population of urban refugees in Nairobi (UNHCR, 2012). Currently, Kenya hosts around 623,873 registered refugees and asylum seekers mainly from the Somalia, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Congo, Eritrea and Burundi (UNHCR, 2012).

The majority of those refugees reside in Kakuma and Dadaab refugee camps. An approximate number of over 54,383 reside in Nairobi while unknown numbers spread in other major urban centers. It is estimated that at least 300,000 refugees both in camps and urban are school-aged children. In collaboration and partnership with the Ministry of Education, City and District Education Offices, UN agencies such as UNICEF and UNESCO, as well as national and international NGOs, UNHCR have provided both formal and informal education in Kenyan refugee camps, using the Kenya Curriculum as its guide (Dix, 2006). This has enabled refugee children and youth in both camp and urban contexts to access education that results in Kenyan certification.
The government of Kenya shows its commitment to the Education for All (EFA) goals, through the implementation of the Free Primary Education (FPE) policy, which was enacted in the year 2003. The National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government introduction of Free Primary Education is a commitment to realize the Universal Primary Education. Achieving the UPE and by ensuring that all the pupils complete a full course of primary schooling is also one of the Millennium Development Goals as pledged by the 189 United Nations member states. In effort to this, fees and levies for tuition, in primary education have been abolished. The government of Kenya and the development partners are meeting the cost of basic training and learning materials, wages for critical non-teaching staff and co-curricular activities (Republic of Kenya, 2007). The enactment of Basic Education Act 2013 by the Kenyan government is a huge effort towards the realization of the EFA goals. The government enacted several acts, to enable children access the education, among them are sections 25 (right of the child to free and compulsory education), section 26 (free tuition), section 27 (compulsory primary and secondary education) and section 29 (responsibility of the government on the free primary education). In these sections, it is stipulated that every child living in Kenya, has a right to access the primary education, and is entitled to the same treatment as the native Kenyans (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

However, many urban refugees lack awareness of their rights and are unable to exercise them. In addition, while in some areas primary schools welcome refugee children, in others they request an admission fee, often in the form of a
bribe for the headmaster, who otherwise would find excuses not to admit refugee children (World Refugee Survey, 2009). Poor refugees also find it difficult to access education due to the cost of transport, books, uniforms, desks and school fees (Dix, 2006). The Kenya national examination council (KNEC, 2010) gave a directive making birth certificate a requirement for registration for the national examinations. This move makes it hard for the refugees to register the examinations, since their country of birth is not Kenya. The case is even harder, when it comes to the urban refugees, bearing the fact that the urban refugees do not have access to the UNHCR registration services, not unless they have to travel back to the camps, to access the registration documentation. The official documentation to ensure that their children can access the primary education system, for example a form of identification for the child’s guardian or parent and the child’s birth certificate, is another challenge facing education to refugee children (Burton & Guiney, 2008). In some public schools in Eastleigh up to 70% of children are from refugee families, though in most cases children prefer to hide their refugee status and speak and act like Kenyans to avoid stigma and discrimination. Some refugees prefer to send their children to schools based on the curriculum and language of the country of origin (Campbell, 2005).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Education to the refugees is a means for a promising future, whether in their home countries or for integration in their countries of asylum. The refugees in Nairobi hope to improve their livelihoods and find alternative educational
settings where their children can have more access and improved quality education, since they are in the city (Dix, 2006). Despite recent efforts to expand educational access to refugee children, primary education remains inaccessible to many of them in Nairobi. In various ways, some Kenyan government policy constrains refugee children’s access to education. In the Nairobi city council primary schools, refugee parents and guardians are required to produce a proper registration document such as UNHCR mandate certificate in addition to the child’s birth certificate (Campbell, 2005). Although many refugee children in Nairobi are born in Kenya, they do not have birth certificates, which hinder their enrolment into public schools in Nairobi. However, proper documentation does not necessarily guarantee access to education by urban refugee children. These are only but a few of the challenges the refugee’s children face, in efforts to access education. The government of Kenya’s commitment to provision of Education for All is then compromised by these challenges. As a step towards realization of EFA goals, a study should be carried out in the locale, to establish the existing efforts by the government to enhance refugee education, and the barriers to education of refugee children that have been brought about by the government policies on education. Therefore this study sought to investigate the effects of government policies on refugee’s education, to refugee’s children access to education, in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of government policy on Free Primary Education on refugee children's access to education, in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To establish the effect of the government policy on Free Primary Education on the access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County;

ii. To examine the effect of the government policy on exam registration on access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County;

iii. To establish the effect of foreign education recognition on access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County;

iv. To suggest strategies to address the challenges facing the refugee pupils’ access to education in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County.

1.5 Research Questions

The study explored for answers to the following questions

i. How does government’s Free Primary Education policy affect access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County?
ii. What is the effect of government’s examination registration policy on access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County?

iii. To what extent does government’s policy on recognition of foreign education affect access to primary education by refugee pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County?

iv. What are the strategies to address the challenges facing the refugee pupils’ access to primary education in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would be of great importance to the Ministry of Education in formulating appropriate policies to enhance participation of refugees in the education. The findings of this study would give the real-time information about the education situation in Kamukunji, and this information is important to the government in developing the education policies, about the refugees. The findings of this study will also provide light to the UNHCR and other concerned organizations on the challenges facing the urban refugees in Kenya. This information is useful in formulation of strategies, provision of aids, and relocation of the refugees.

The findings of this study would be of benefit to the refugee’s children in that the findings will reveal the challenges they are facing in their efforts to access
education. This study would also form a firm foundation for academicians who would be interested in conducting studies in a similar area.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Some of the respondents, especially head teachers, were not willing to fill the questionnaires. Some of the refugee pupils did not want to be identified as refugees. The findings of this study did not reflect the case in other refugee areas that have peace prevailing.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

This study was carried out in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County. It was carried out in public primary schools in the area. It involved the, head teachers, teachers and pupils. It only focused on Free Primary Education policy, examination registration policy and recognition of foreign education as the aspects of government’ education policy which affected access to primary education by refugee pupils. Thus any other variable, though significant, was out of scope.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that the respondents were sincere when filling in the questionnaires. It also assumed that there are factors within the government policy on refugee education which hinders refugee children access education as compared to Kenyan children.

1.10 Operational Definition of Terms

**Education in emergency** refers to is a set of linked project activities that enable structured learning to continue amongst refugee pupils in times of acute crisis or long-term instability
**Examination registration** refers to the process of booking learners to undertake an examination after studying for some time. In this study it involves booking primary school pupils with Kenya National Examination Council, KNEC, as candidates to sit Kenya Certificate of Primary Education national examination.

**Free Primary Education** refers to basic education of class one to class eight, that is fully funded by the Kenyan government.

**Government policy** refers to a set of rules or legal framework which outlines its plan of action in executing its programmes

**Policy** refers to a deliberate plan of action to guide decisions needed to achieve rational outcomes.

**Recognition of foreign education** refers to the acceptance of the educational progress of the learner in his or her country of origin

**Refugee** refers to a person who has fled from and/or cannot return to their country due to a well-founded fear of persecution, including war or civil conflict

**Urban refugee** is a refugee who resides/lives in an urban setting

1.11 **Organization of the study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one consists of the introduction to the study, the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the objectives of the study, the research questions and the significance of the study. Chapter two contains the review of literature, from the past studies, and books. It also contains the theoretical framework and the conceptual framework, showing the relationship of
variables for the study. Chapter three contains research methodology which includes introduction, research design, target population, sample size and sample procedures, data collection instruments, reliability and validity, data collection procedures and data analysis. Chapter four contain the data analysis, presentation and discussion, in which the results of the data collected, was analyzed and presented in forms of graphs and frequency distribution tables. The data is also discussed in this chapter. Chapter five contains the summary of the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter contains a review of related literature, under the following subtopics; education to refugees, effects of government’s policy on free primary education, effects of government policies on examination registration and effects of recognition of foreign education on access to primary education by refugee pupils. It also provides literature on the host government’s efforts towards improvement of refugee education in Kenya, summary of literature review, conceptual framework and theoretical framework

2.2 Education for Refugees
The refugee populations recorded in the 2009 UNHCR Statistical Overview (UNHCR, 2010), totalling 7.5 million, there would be a total of about 2.8 million in the child and adolescent age group. This may be compared with the total of nearly 1.2 million children and young people recorded as beneficiaries of UNHCR-funded education programmes, to which must be added an unknown number who benefit from other assistance programmes or participate in schooling in the host country without special assistance. These very approximate statistics suggest that one-third of refugee pupils and adolescents in populations categorized as UNHCR assisted are in UNHCR-supported schooling. Establishment of schools in or near refugee camps is felt to have a beneficial effect on the mental state of adults as well as of children. Education can partially substitute for poor child–adult interactions in the family, a role which is less important for most children in normal times. It also
has practical benefits, in that mothers are able to concentrate on their tasks, such as queuing for food and water, and so on, without having to worry that their young children will get lost in the camp or come to harm. The parents or other relatives caring for children may initially be stressed and unable to cope with children’s emotional needs. For this reason, schooling for the refugee children has an additional advantage to them (UNHCR, 2005). It is the responsibility of the country of asylum to assist and protect the refugee’s children and youth. The asylum countries are required to enable refugees’ pupils to receive an education, which should be free and compulsory at the primary level with efforts made to ensure full and equal participation of women and girls. With respect to post-primary education, education and training programs should be made available to the refugees, in particular adolescents and women, as soon as conditions permit (UN, 1998).

Campbell (2005) argues that in Kenya, more than 32,000 children attend primary school at the camps’ schools. Every year over 2,000 children complete primary education with great hope of continuing to secondary school, but the camps have only a few secondary schools with an intake of 480 new pupils per year. As a result, every year some 1,500 young people find their hopes of secondary education unfulfilled, and this large group of disappointed youth remain in the camps without meaningful activity (Campbell, 2005). Poverty is also considered as a stumbling block to the refugee’s education. Poor refugees also find it difficult to access education due to the cost of transport, books, uniforms, desks and school fees (Dix, 2006). With the current economic difficulties, poverty amongst the refugee families is
a common factor. This makes it difficult for them to access education in the private schools, leaving them with the only option of public primary schools. In the public schools, Refugee families need official documentation to ensure that their children can access the primary education, for example a form of identification for the child’s guardian or parent and the child’s birth certificate. In some public schools in Eastleigh up to 70% of children are from refugee families, though in most cases children prefer to hide their refugee status (UNHCR, 2012).

2.3 Free Primary Education Policy and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

The UNHCR (2012) observed that the nature of the refugee education context in Kenya requires support from the MoE to establish a more sustainable and strengthened approach to education that can address the challenges facing the sector and bring benefits to the national system. The UNHCR called for expertise, guidance and sustained support to be availed through the MoE policies on education. UNHCR, UNICEF and UNESCO welcomed the support and guidance of the MoE to situate and support the delivery of education to all children within its borders through delivery and monitoring of the national Kenyan Education Programme.

The Kenyan Basic Education Act (2013) gives equal chances and treatment for all the children in Kenya, to the education access. By this, the refugee’s children are also given equal rights to access, the education, and equal
treatment, in the access to the education services. In this Act are sections 25, 26, 27, and 29.

25 (1) Every child has a right to free and compulsory education, and shall be accorded an education programme that is appropriate to their needs (RoK, 2012).

26 (1) No public school shall charge, or cause any parent, guardian or any other person acting in the *loco parentis* capacity, to pay tuition fee for or on behalf of any pupil in a public institution of basic education and training (RoK, 2012).

27 (1b) Every child who resides in Kenya, shall attend regularly as a pupil at a school or such other institution, as may be authorized and prescribed by the cabinet secretary, for the purposes of physical, intellectual or social development of the child.

29 (b) It is the responsibility of the cabinet secretary to ensure compulsory admission, attendance of basic education by every child.

(d) It is the responsibility of the cabinet secretary to ensure that children belonging to a disadvantaged group are not discriminated against and prevented from pursuing and completing the basic education.

These sections advocate for the Education for All, and in them, the refugees children are not left out. In 2006, the government of Kenya passed a Refugee Act implementing the 1951 United Nations Convention Related to the Status of Refugees, the 1967 Protocol and the 1969 OAU Convention. The
development of the Act followed a period of sustained advocacy by UNHCR and civil society organizations, including RCK. The Act classifies refugees into two main groups, statutory refugees and prima facie refugees, and lays out the conditions for the exclusion and withdrawal of refugee status. This includes those who have committed crimes either outside or within Kenya, have dual nationality and are able to seek refuge in their second country of origin, or people from places where the conditions for seeking refuge no longer exist.

2.4 Examination Registration Policy and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Primary Education

Refugee children in Kenya and especially in Kamukunji Nairobi are taught the Kenyan Curriculum and therefore must take final national examinations at both primary and secondary levels for certification. Presently, the Kenyan Ministry of Education policy requires that all pupils writing final national examinations must provide birth certificates for registration purposes (MoE, 2010). This is a challenge for many urban refugees as often they are required to leave their home countries unexpectedly, and no longer have access to official documentation, including existing school certification.

The Urban Refugee camps in Kenya contain thousands of primary school leavers who have not had the opportunity to benefit from secondary education. Most of them drop out before even getting the chance to sit for the national examination, due to a variety of reasons. Among these reasons are the lack of the appropriate documentation to be in the country, and lack of the birth
certificates, which are a mandatory requirement for the registration of the
Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE). Opportunities for vocational
training and employment are extremely limited in for Urban Refugee. In this
situation, families arrange for their daughters to get married at an early age;
boys may spend long hours chewing miraa and drinking tea (Dix, 2006). They
do not have the opportunity to reach their development potential. Like the
refugees, many young people in Kenya are excluded from secondary
education for various reasons, including the cost of tuition fees.

2.5 Recognition of Foreign Education and Refugee Pupils’ Access to
Primary Education

A study carried out in Sierra Leone indicated that refugee children and youth
who returned to their country after the war was over, the Ministry of
Education did not recognize the education they had received in the refugee
camps (UNHCR, 2004). The returnee pupils in secondary school were sent
back to the first grade when they returned home because their refugee learning
was not recognized. Guidance for UNHCR education programs states the
agency’s commitment to seeking formal certification for pupils in its refugee
programs through coordination at the local, national, regional, and global
levels to certify studies, citing that it is wasteful if education and training does
not result in documented, officially recognized certificates (UNHCR, 2003).

While the Government of Kenya guarantees the right to free primary
education to both refugees and nationals, many refugees lack awareness of
their rights and are unable to exercise them. In addition, while in some areas
primary schools welcome refugee children, in others they request an 
admission fee, often in the form of a bribe for the headmaster, who otherwise 
would find excuses not to admit refugee children (World Refugee Survey, 
2009). Although there are international rights established in concern to 
education for refugees, there is a lack of consistency in application of these 
rights when it comes to the recognition and certification of refugee and IDP 
children’s diplomas and other school attainments (Talbot, 2006). Refugee 
pupils are therefore receiving an education but have no proof that it is 
considered legitimate. Beyond ensuring access to education, those involved in 
providing displaced and refugee children with education need to ensure that 
their learning attainments are validated. Official recognition of learning 
attainment, conducted through certification and validation, is a central, yet still 
largely overlooked, component of education for displaced children and youth. 
Recognition and certification is essential at the end of a schooling cycle, 
completion of primary or secondary, but is also important for mid-cycle 
transfers, especially those that occur mid-year, so that a displaced student in 
the middle of course is not forced to return to the beginning when he/she 
enrolls in a new school. However, in Kenya, Refugee-school certificates from 
the country of origin are not recognized by the Kenyan Ministry of Education. 
This now becomes another hindering factor to the refugee’s continuation of 
education.

Awarding of certificate or similar documentation can be hindered by both 
technical issues including differing validation processes across borders and the
loss or destruction of such documents during displacement, and political issues relating to national sovereignty and corruption (Kirk, 2008). Kirk (2008) further argues that any formal proof or documentation of achievement must have validity beyond its particular system, otherwise children’s ability to use their education as human capital in the marketplace, or to add to it through further study, is obstructed. Kirk (2009) suggested three approaches to what curriculum should be used for the formal schooling of refugee children and youth. In the first approach, the home-country curriculum can be carried over for use in the refugee context; in the second approach, the curriculum of the host-country can be adopted and children can be educated in either separate schools or integrated into the host-country education system; and third approach, a hybrid curriculum that typically addresses disparate language issues between the home and host countries and may contain elements of both countries’ curricula can be developed.

The recognition of foreign refugee certificate is affected by several factors. Among them, the relationship between the host country and the home country with respect to language, ethnicity, and national identity is often closely related to what type of curriculum the country of origin uses and how/if previous and current educational attainment is recognized (Kirk, 2009). The closer the social and cultural ties are between the two countries, the easier the certification process. In cases where these differences are significant, the process to develop an appropriate education system for refugees becomes much more complex. Most of the schools in the refugee camps rely on the untrained teachers, and particularly from inside the camp itself (Campbell,
Reliance on untrained teachers compromises the quality of education offered, and as a result, the average marks of pupils in the camps are lower than the national average. Pupils are not able to reach their full potential. The untrained teachers are highly motivated, but lack skills in delivering the Kenyan national curriculum and in managing large classes with very few resources.

2.6 Host Government’s Strategies to Improve Refugee Education in Kenya

It is proposed that the International Primary Teachers Education Certificate – IPTEC- based on the Primary Teachers Education Syllabus adapted for Kakuma Primary Teachers’ College (2005/2006) be used to train the 700 refugee teachers in Dadaab. The Kakuma Teachers Training College curriculum was specifically designed by the Kenya Institute of Education for refugees living in Kakuma refugee camp. The curriculum was adapted from the Kenyan Primary Teacher Education (PTE) curriculum revised in 2004. The two-year PTE course was shortened to a one – year general teacher training course with a view to accelerating the programme without compromising quality. In Kakuma schools operated in the mornings. This made it possible for teachers to attend training in the afternoons. In addition, teaching was also done during the holidays to ensure full coverage of the curriculum so that the Kenyan Ministry of Education would award a certificate (UNHCR, 2007). The Kenya Institute of Education is currently developing the adapted curriculum for refugee’s children. Once the curriculum has been
approved by the Ministry of Education, it will be passed on to the publishers to prepare textbooks for the learners (MOE 2010)

In the urban context of Nairobi, UNHCR is the primary agency providing services to refugees. UNHCR’s work in Nairobi is guided by the 2009 UNHCR Urban Refugee policy, which committed the agency to examine, understand and respond to the needs of refugees living in the Kenyan capital. UNHCR has been able to raise refugee pupils’ enrollment rates, coordinate with Nairobi NGOs and CBOs, build a system in which refugees and asylees can be documented and registered in urban areas, and has provided education services in urban schools. The primary challenge of offering services in Nairobi as compared to Kakuma is that urban refugees are more dispersed, making it more difficult for UNHCR to locate and implement programs for potential beneficiaries.

To accomplish their mandate, UNHCR has partnered with NGOs and the refugee community to improve UNHCR’s access and reach in the urban refugee community. One powerful example of UNHCR’s successful partner-building is a coalition the agency formed with the City Education Department that led to a spike in refugee enrolment at the primary level. UNHCR also convened two inter-agency working groups that advocated for refugees’ access to primary education and the completion of the Refugee Act of 2006. UNHCR has formed strong relationships with NGOs and CBOs in Nairobi, allowing them to offer services to hard-to-reach beneficiaries via their collaborative strategy. Though UNHCR has been implementing the UNHCR
urban refugee policy in Nairobi, and found support in the county government of Nairobi as well as other local government actors, the Government of Kenya has not formally endorsed the policy nor agreed to its implementation. In a 2011 review of UNHCR’s urban refugee policy implementation, however, it was noted that the Kenyan government seemed to be taking a number of steps that align with UNHCR’s policy which may signal a change of perception on the case of urban refugees in Nairobi. Though this is a positive sign, it cannot go unmentioned that in December of 2012 the Kenyan government released a renewed encampment directive ordering all urban refugees to relocate to refugee camps.

The Government of Kenya suspended refugee and asylee registration following the announcement, and refugees reported police harassment and detention. Ultimately, the refugee community petitioned the directive and it was later rejected in Kenya’s High Court. Though this is a victory for urban and camp-based refugees alike, it remains to be seen how committed the Government of Kenya will be toward both protecting the rights of refugees and asylees in urban areas and working toward policies to ease the burden of the ballooning Kakuma refugee population, which surpassed its 100,000 person capacity in 2012 and continues to grow. Across these urban and camp-based programs are common ties: a focus on English instruction, including teacher training so that teachers may effectively teach English to their refugee students, and particularly in Kakuma, a struggle to meet growing class sizes with both limited supplies and poor teacher to student ratios. These programs suggest that organizations are finding ways to salve the challenges of
education provision that arise from Government of Kenya’s language and encampment policies, considering the challenges that come with implementing in Kakuma, a setting that was initially meant to be a short-term solution and is now moving into more than two decades of operation. The revised refugee’s curriculum includes study guides, learning materials and textbooks to help pupils to follow the curriculum independently or with limited assistance from a facilitator or animator (MoE, 2010). In particular, the sciences curriculum is adapted so that use of a laboratory is not required; instead pupils can perform simple experiments in a home or classroom setting. All the subjects of the expanded secondary curriculum are examinable by the Kenya National Examination Council, and thus pupils will sit for the national examinations to receive the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. They will have a recognized secondary school certificate and access to higher education.

2.7 Summary of Literature Review

The literature reviewed above shows studies carried out in Kenya and other different parts of the world, on the policies and issues affecting the education of refugee children. The available literature is mainly focused on the education of the refugees in the refugee camps, which in most cases are located in the remote areas. However there exists a gap in the literature on how the government policies affect the education of the urban refugees children, and more particularly, in Kenya. This study sought to establish the effects of the government policies on free primary education, on urban refugee’s access to the education in Kenya, and particularly in Kamukunji District.
2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by the Acculturation Theory by Witold (1918). The theory explains dynamics involved when people from diverse cultural backgrounds come into continuous contact with one another. The Theory of Acculturation has evolved from the unidirectional school of thought with an emphasis on assimilation to bidimensional and interactive perspectives which posit various acculturative outcomes. At the psychological level, changes can occur in one’s sense of identity, values, and beliefs; people may experience acculturation stress such as anxiety and depression as they try to adapt to a new cultures of their new destination. The sociology of immigration recognizes that outcomes for immigrant minorities, including urban refugee immigrants, are significantly influenced by group’s mode of incorporation, that is, the context in which immigrants enter, plays a decisive role in their process of adaptation, regardless of the human capital the immigrants may possess (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990).

Thus urban refugees who receive settlement assistance and are not subject to widespread discrimination are expected to experience a smoother process of social and psychological integration and faster economic progress. In this context, the urban refugees move from their country of origin to the asylum country, where they meet and live with its citizens and other refugees from different countries, and with different cultures and lifestyles. The challenge comes up when the refugees are assimilating themselves in the system of the
host country, which in most cases, is usually different from that of their country of origin. The situation is even worse in African countries, owing to the fact of the different cultural and political backgrounds.

In Kenya for instance, being in an urban setting, is a host to many refugees from different parts of Africa. The progress of the refugees is primarily determined by the reception they receive in the country of asylum. For instance, the Kenyan education system is unique in its own way, in terms of content, form and requirements and this makes it difficult for the refugees to exactly fit into the already existing education system. The Kenyan government is a host to many refugees, from Somalia and other countries in Africa. Efforts by the government of Kenya to provide education to the urban refugees are an important step towards their stay, and their wellbeing, during their stay in this country. The theory is relevant to this study in that, despite the numerous efforts by the government to promote the Education for All (EFA), there exists some mismatch in the education system and policies that in some ways disadvantage the refugee’s children access.
2.9 Conceptual frameworks:
A conceptual framework shows the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Independent variables are those variables which are systematically varied by the researcher. On the other hand, dependent variables are those variables whose values are presumed to depend on the effects of the independent variables (Mugenda 2008)

Relationship between government policy factors affecting refugees’
pupils’ access to primary education

**Free Primary Education Policy**
- Enrolment procedures
- Equity, fairness and

**Examination Registration**
- Original proof of qualification
- Progressive reports
- Examination registration fee

**Recognition of Foreign Education**
- report
  - Forms or mark sheets
- Mode of grading

- Improved access to primary education
- Increased enrollment of refugees
- Better learning opportunities for refugees

**Increased access to primary education**

Figure 1: conceptual framework
In this study, the conceptual framework was based on government’s education policy reflected through free primary education policy, examination registration policy and policy on recognition of foreign education which constituted independent variables whereas accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils constituted dependent variables. The indicators of dependent variables include better learning opportunities and increased enrolments. The study was also guided by intervening variables which included trained teaching staff, instructional resources, stakeholders’ involvement and availability of pre-requisite infrastructure as shown in Figure 1;
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the methodology that the study followed. It explains the design; location of study; population; sample size, sampling techniques and procedure; data collection instruments; methods of testing the validity and reliability of instruments; the research procedure that will be followed; and the data management and analysis techniques that were used in conducting the study.

3.2 Research Design
The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The descriptive survey was appropriate for the study since it allowed the researcher to study phenomena that do not allow for manipulation of variables (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). Since the study involved human subjects, and the information needed could not be manipulated, the researcher just collected information on the state of refugees’ affairs in education, without manipulating any variables making the design appropriate for the study. According to Lockesh (1984) descriptive research studies are designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the status of phenomena and whenever possible to draw valid general conclusions from the facts discovered.
3.3 Target Population

Kamukunji District has 17 public primary schools with 17 primary school head teachers, 351 teachers and 3,500 refugee pupils which formed the target population for this study all totalling to 3,868.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Sampling is a process of selecting a number of individuals or objects from a population such that the selected group contains elements representative of characteristics found in the entire group (Orodho, 2004). Kombo and Tromp (2006) assert that with relatively small, clearly defined population, a sample size of at least 10%-30% of the target population would be representative. 5 schools were randomly selected. 350 pupils were sampled using simple random sampling. The researcher obtained a list of pupils who indicated their refugee status in their admission details, then compiled a list of all refugee pupils from classes 5, 6, 7 and 8, in each and every school. Each name was designed an identifying number, and then the numbers were written on pieces of paper. The papers were folded and mixed. The researcher then picked at random, the number of pieces of paper equal to the sampled calculated. The names corresponding to those numbers were picked for the study. From the sampled schools, the head teachers and 2 other headteachers to make a total of 7 head teachers and 8 teachers from the 5 schools who teach classes 5, 6, 7 and 8 were randomly sampled. The resultant sample comprised 7 head teachers, 40 teachers and 350 pupils as shown in Table 3.3
Table 3.3: Sample Size Determination and Sampling Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school head teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Pupils</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3868</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size for this study totals to 398 respondents which is 10.3% of the target population and therefore representative of the target population.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

These are tools which were to gather information about the research objectives. This study employed a questionnaire as a data collection instrument.

The study utilized questionnaires as data collection instruments. Gay (1992) argues that questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinion and also to make suggestions. To obtain the necessary information, the researcher developed two questionnaires namely head teacher’s questionnaire and the teacher’s questionnaire. Borg and Gall (1983) emphasize that whereas the open ended type of questions give informants freedom of response, the closed ended types facilitate consistency of certain data across informants. The questionnaires contained both open and closed ended items. The head teachers’ questionnaire had five parts: part 1: demographic information; part 2: government FPE policy effect on access to primary education for refugee pupils; part 3: the government policy on exams
registration effect on refugee access to primary education; part 4: the effects of government policies on recognition of foreign education and academic certificates awarded to refugees on refugee access to primary education and part 5: the strategies to address the challenges facing the refugees children in access to education. The teachers’ questionnaire had five parts: part 1: demographic information; part 2: government FPE policy effect on access to primary education for refugee pupils; part 3: the government policy on exams registration effect on refugee access to primary education; part 4: the effects of government policies on recognition of foreign education and refugee access to primary education and part 5: the strategies to address the challenges facing the refugees children in access to education

Questionnaires for pupils had five parts: part 1: demographic information; part 2: government FPE policy and access to primary education by refugee pupils; part 3: the government policy on exams registration and access to primary education by refugee pupils; part 4: the effects of government policies on recognition of foreign education and access to primary education and part 5: the strategies to address the challenges facing access to education by refugee pupils.

3.6 Validity of the Research Instruments

According to Borg and Gall (1983) validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purport to measure. It is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomena under study. According to Borg and Gall (1983), validity of an instrument is improved through expert judgment. The researcher piloted the instruments in
one school and after the piloting; the form and the content validity of the instruments validity were ascertained by the researcher. Pilot study was carried out in two weeks before the actual day of study amongst 5 Head teachers, 10 teachers and 20 refugee pupils amongst primary schools in Kamukunji District. The test items were administered twice to the same respondents. The purpose of conducting the pilot study was to check on suitability and the clarity of the questions on the questionnaire, relevance of the information being sought and the language used and to test the reliability and validity of the instrument. Some of the questions in the questionnaires were changed to make them fit the findings of the pilot study.

3.6.1 Reliability of the Research instruments

Grinnel (1993) observes that reliability measures the degree of accuracy in measurements an instrument provides. It ensures that the instrument generates similar data when used by an independent researcher. Grinnel (1993) further argues that to remove possible errors every instrument should be tested before it is formally administered to ensure its reliability. During the piloting, the researcher administered a set of questionnaires to the respondents, and after a week, the researcher administered the same instruments to the same respondents again. A test-retest technique or co-efficient stability method was used to estimate the degree to which the same results could be obtained with a repeated measure of accuracy. Since the two tests were similar score obtained by each respondent was quite close. Cronbach’s Alpha Method was then used to compute correlation coefficient which gave $r = 0.74$ for the teacher’s
questionnaires and r=0.72 for head teachers’ questionnaires. The reliability was above 0.5 thus indicating high internal reliability.

The researcher used this approach to calculate the correlation co-efficient using the below formula.

\[
r = \frac{n \Sigma xy - (\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{\left[n \Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2\right] \left[n \Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2\right]}}
\]

where \( x \) = first set of scores; \( y \) = second set of scores; \( \Sigma x \) = sum of the first set of scores; \( \Sigma y \) = the sum of the second set of scores; \( \Sigma x^2 \) = the sum of first set of scores; \( \Sigma y^2 \) = the sum square of second set of scores; \( \Sigma xy \) = the sum of cross product of \( x \) and \( y \) and \( n \) = total number of respondents. From the findings, the determined correlation coefficients for teachers’, head teachers and pupils were 0.74, 0.72, and 0.71. According to Grinnel (1993), reliability coefficient above + 0.5 is satisfactory.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher first obtained an introduction letter from School of Postgraduate of University of Nairobi and then sought an authorization letter and research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) to carry out the study. The researcher then made a formal request from the Kamukunji Sub-county Education Office to carry out the research in the public primary schools in the sub-county. The researcher visited the sampled primary schools and personally administered the questionnaires to the respondents. Respondents were also assured
that the information they gave would be confidential and were used for academic purposes only.

3.8 Data Analysis Techniques

Data from the field was collected, cleaned, coded and recorded. Analysis procedure employed both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically where similar response were tallied to come up with frequency counts and then percentages calculated based on the total number of responses. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics including frequency counts and percentages. Bell (1993) maintains that when making the results known to a variety of readers, percentages have considerable advantage over more complex statistics. Data was presented in summary form using the frequency distribution tables and charts.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study. For clarity and chronology, it is arranged by the three research questions that the study sought to answer. In the first section, however, background information about the respondents is presented, because it might be pertinent in interpreting the data that they provided. Thus, the chapter is divided into three subsections namely, introduction, background information about the respondents and the research questions that the study sought to answer.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate

The questionnaires were administered in person to the respondents. Out of the 385 questionnaires administered, 372 were successfully filled and returned. This gave a response rates as indicated in Table 4.1;

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Sampled Respondents</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Archived Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Pupils</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above information shows that the total return rate was 96.62% affirming the fact that the response rate was sufficient and above 75% of the acceptable levels to enable generalization of the results to the target population (Kothari, 2005).

4.3 Respondents Demographic Information

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

The study sought to establish how the sample population was distributed by gender. Table 4.2 data reveals how the study subjects were distributed by gender.

Table 4.2: Distribution of the Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Refugee Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on the table 4.2 below indicates that the majority (83.3%) of the head teachers were male, as compared to the (16.7%) who were female. The study further established that the majority (60%) of the teachers were female as compared to (40%) who were male. The study further established that the majority (62.8%) of the refugee pupils interviewed were male, as compared to
(37.2%) who were female. These results affirmed the fact that there was gender disparity at all levels.

4.3.2 Age of Head teachers and Teachers

The questionnaires also elicited information on head teachers’ and teachers’ ages since this variable could influence their ability to supply credible information about the research objectives. The results were as indicated as shown Figure 4.1;

![Figure 4.1: Distribution of Head teachers and Teachers by Age](image)

These findings reveal that majority of the head teachers were well over 50 years while a sizeable number were aged between 30-40 years and 40-50 years. The study further indicates that majority of the teachers were aged between 30-40 years while a sizeable number of the teachers were aged 20-30 years and 40-50 years. These findings imply that the information that they
provided is reliable since plausible reasoning can be expected of head teachers and teachers with such level of maturity.

4.3.3 Head teachers’ and Teachers’ Level of Education

The questionnaires also elicited information on head teachers’ and teachers’ ages since this variable could influence their ability to supply credible information about the research objectives. The results were as indicated as shown in Table 4.3;

Table 4.3: Distribution of Head teachers and Teachers by Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shown on table 4.3 indicates that the majority (50%) of the head teachers had a postgraduate in education while 33.3% had a P1 certificate. The data further shows that the majority 57.69% of the teachers had a P1 certificate whereas 23.08% had postgraduate and 19.23% had diploma. This information
reveals that the teachers in the study location met the minimum qualification to become a teacher and were all qualified and trained teachers.

4.3.4 Head teachers’ Teaching and Leadership Experience

Information was also collected about head teachers’ teaching and leadership experience and the results were as indicated in Table 4.4;

Table 4.4: Distribution of Head teachers by Teaching and Leadership Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of teaching</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that most of the head teachers who were involved in the study had teaching and leadership experience stretching well over 12 years. These findings reinforce the expectation that information they provided is authoritative since plausible reasoning is expected from head teachers with such wealth of experience.

4.3.5 Teachers’ Teaching Experience

Information was also collected about teachers’ teaching experience and the results were as indicated in Table 4.5;
Table 4.5: Distribution of Teachers by Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of teaching</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-12 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that most of the head teachers who were involved in the study had teaching experience stretching well over 12 years. These findings reinforce the expectation that information they provided is authoritative since plausible reasoning is expected from teachers with such teaching experience.

4.3.6 Age of Refugee Pupils

The questionnaires also elicited information on refugee pupils in classes 6 and 7 and the results were as indicated as shown Figure 4.2;

![Figure 4.2: Distribution of Refugee Pupils by Age](image-url)
These findings reveal that majority of the refugee pupils were aged between 10-12 years. The study further indicates that a small number of pupils were aged between 0-9 years and 14-15 years. These findings indicate that the information that they provided is reliable since competent reasoning is expected of pupils with such level of maturity.

4.4 Findings on Free Primary Education Policy and Pupils’ Access to education

The research question intended to find out how government’s policy on FPE enhances accessibility to education by refugee pupils. This was necessary since FPE policy is designed to ensure pupils’ enrolment procedures. Data was collected from head teachers. Collected data was organized and summarized into specific thoughts and results were as indicated in Table 4.6;
Table 4.6 Head teachers’ Views on FPE Policy and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

Key: StronglyAgree-5, Agree-4, Undecided-3, Decided-2, Stronglydecided-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy guidelines are not clear on enrolment of refugee pupils</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education policies do not adequately cover refugee pupils</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are here illegally and so they fear taking their children to school</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration certificate is a requirement for refugee pupil enrolment</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy hinders on refugee pupils’ accessibility to education</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy do not hinder refugee pupils’ accessibility to education</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 6

The data on the table 4.6 above reveals that the majority of the head teachers (57.1%) strongly agreed to the fact that FPE policy guidelines on enrolments are not clear on the refugee’s pupils. The study further indicated that 14.3% of the head teachers agreed, whereas 28.6% disagreed. These findings affirm the
fact that FPE policy has stringent regulations on enrolment of refugee pupils. These views were further supported by 28.6% and 42.9% of the head teachers who strongly agreed and agreed respectively. They intimated that FPE policy does not adequately cover enrolments for refugee pupils. Interestingly, 14.3% of the head teachers were undecided. This lends credence to the fact that some of the head teachers were not aware of the procedural requirements of Basic Education Act, 2013 and refugee education in Kenya. Majority of the head teachers (57.1%) strongly agreed that registration certificate is a requirement for enrolment of refugee pupils. Similar majority of the head teachers (57.1%) established that most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are in the country illegally and so they fear taking children to schools. The study findings revealed that majority (67.5%) of the head teachers strongly agreed that FPE policy does not hinder the refugee pupils’ accessibility to education. They indicated that refugee pupils’ accessibility to education is hampered by lack of transport, books, uniforms and desks.

The same question was put to the teachers and results were as indicated in Table 4.7 below;
### Table 4.7 Teachers’ Views on FPE Policy and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy guidelines are not clear on enrolment of refugee pupils</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education policies do not adequately cover refugee pupils</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are here illegally and so they fear taking their children to school</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration certificate is a requirement for refugee pupil enrolment</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy hinders on refugee pupils’ accessibility to education</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPE policy does not hinder refugee pupils’ accessibility to education</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=38

The data on the table 4.7 above reveals that 22.7% of teachers strongly agreed whereas a record majority (50%) of the teachers agreed to the fact that FPE policy guidelines on enrolments are not clear on the refugee’s pupils. On the contrary, 9.1% and 13.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to the fact that FPE policy guidelines are not clear on enrolments of refugee pupils. These findings affirm the fact that FPE policy has regulations on enrolment of refugee pupils.
refugee pupils which must be met. These views were further supported by 13.6% and 40.9% of the head teachers who strongly agreed and agreed respectively. They intimated that FPE policy does not adequately cover enrolments for refugee pupils. Interestingly, 4.5% and 13.6% of the teachers were undecided. This lends credence to the fact that some of the teachers were not aware of the procedural requirements of Basic Education Act, 2013 and refugee education in Kenya. Majority of the head teachers (27.3%) strongly agreed that registration certificate is a requirement for enrolment of refugee pupils. Similar majority of the teachers (40.9%) established that most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are in the country illegally and so they fear taking children to schools. The study findings revealed that majority (71.5%) of the head teachers strongly agreed that FPE policy does not hinder the refugee pupils’ accessibility to education. They indicated that refugee pupils’ accessibility to education is hampered by lack of transport, books, uniforms and desks.

The researcher also asked refugee pupils similar questions and the findings were as indicated in Table 4.8 below;
### Table 4.8 Refugee Pupils’ Views on FPE Policy and Refugee Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Items</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a registered refugee?</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you admitted in school with or without the necessary documentation?</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the admission to the school, were you asked for any admission fees?</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any money paid towards your education?</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been sent home for any school levy?</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know any refuge pupil who does not go school?</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=340

The majority (54%) of the refugee pupils indicated that they were registered as refugees while 46% of the refugee pupils indicated that they were not registered. This confirms the fact that quite a number of refugees in Kamukunji District are not legally recognized yet they are in school affirming the fact refugee registration documents are not a necessity for admission of refugee pupils in primary schools. This view was supported majority (60%) of the refugee pupils. The study further established that the refugee pupils were not charged admission fees as indicated by majority.
4.5 Findings on Exam Registration Policy and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

The study sought to establish the government policy on examination registration affects access to primary education by refugee pupils. Data was collected from head teachers. The results were indicated as shown in Table 4.9;

Table 4.9: Head teachers’ Views on Exam Registration Policy and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation for proof of qualification and registration fees are</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements for examination registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees are discriminated against due to lack of exam registration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amongst refugee pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination registration policy does not affect accessibility to primary</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education amongst refugee pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=6

The data on the table 4.9 above indicates that majority (66.7%) of the head teachers strongly agreed that documents for original proof of qualification and
registration fees are requirements for refugee and non-refugee pupils to register for examination. This is due to the fact that most of the refugee pupils cannot afford to provide proof of qualification and sometimes even raising the Kshs. 800 exam registration is a challenge. The findings also indicate that majority (66.7%) of the head teachers disagreed that refugee pupils are discriminated against due to lack of examination registration documents.

This was supported by 33.3% of the head teachers who strongly disagreed with the fact that refugee pupils are being discriminated against. Those who disagreed indicated that such requirements are stipulated in the Basic Education Act, 2013. The findings of the study also revealed that most (44.5%) of the head teachers acknowledged the fact that measures by the Basic Education Act, 2013 for production of documents for exam registration greatly impedes accessibility to education by refugee pupils. This view was, equally, supported by 33.3% of the head teachers who indicated that examination policy on examination registration immensely affects refugee pupils’ accessibility to primary education

The researcher also elicited the views of the teachers on the effects of examination registration policy on access to primary education by refugee pupils and results were as indicated in Table 4.10;
Table 4.10: Teachers’ Views on Exam Registration Policy and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation for proof of qualification and registration fees are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements for examination registration</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees are discriminated against due to lack of exam registration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amongst refugee pupils</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination registration policy does not affect accessibility to primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education amongst refugee pupils</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=38
The data on the table 4.10 above similarly indicates that majority (59.7%) of the teachers strongly agreed that documents for original proof of qualification and registration fees are requirements for refugee and non-refugee pupils to register for examination. They also stated the fact that most of the refugee pupils cannot afford to provide proof of qualification and sometimes even find it difficult to raise the KShs. 800 exam registration fee. The findings also indicate that majority (65.5%) of the ad teachers disagreed that refugee pupils
are discriminated against due to lack of examination registration documents. This was supported by 29.5% of the head teachers who strongly disagreed with the fact that refugee pupils are being discriminated against. The teachers who disagreed indicated that such requirements are stipulated in the Basic Education Act, 2013. Just like head teachers, the findings of the study also revealed that most (54.5%) of the teachers acknowledged the fact that measures by the Basic Education Act, 2013 for production of documents for exam registration greatly impedes accessibility to education by refugee pupils. This view was, equally, supported by 23.3% of the teachers who indicated that examination policy on examination registration immensely affects refugee pupils’ accessibility to primary education. The research question also solicited the views of refugee pupils on the effects of examination registration policy and access to primary education. Data was collected and results were as indicated in Table 4.11;
Table 4.11: Refugee Pupils’ Views on Exam Registration Policy and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Items</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been asked to produce documentation for proof of qualification to register for examination of any kind?</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been asked to pay registration fees for any kind of examination?</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been discriminated against due to lack of exam registration documents?</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils?</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=340

The data on the table 4.11 above similarly indicates that majority (73.4%) of the refugee pupils responded in favor of the fact that documents of proof of qualification for examination are requirements for one to register for examination. They also indicated that registration fee is another significant requirement for refugee pupil to register for examination with a record
majority (97%) responding in favor. Only a paltry proportion (3%) responded on the contrary. Based on these requirements for examination registration, an impressive proportion (51.9%) intimated that they are discriminated against due to lack of exam registration documents and registration fees and thus majority (79.7%) of them indicated that such examination registration regulations impede their accessibility to primary education. On the contrary, a small proportion (20.3%) of the refugee pupils indicated that their inaccessibility to primary education is a consequence of their socio-economic status and not exam registration policy.

4.6 Findings on Recognition of Foreign Education and Pupils’ Access to Education

The research question intended to find out the effect of the government’s policy on recognition of foreign education in other nations. It focused on establishing the government’s recognition of refugee pupils’ academic reports, mark sheets and other documentation from countries of origin and how such recognition affects accessibility to primary education by the refugee pupils. Data was collected from head teachers and the results were indicated as shown in Table 4.12;
### Table 4.12: Head teachers’ Views on Recognition of Foreign Education and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade system of refugee pupils’ countries of origin is totally different</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to establish the educational level of refugee pupils and thus they do a pre-admission examination</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers hinder education and learning opportunities for refugees</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of foreign education affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of foreign education does not affect accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=6

The data on the table 4.12 above indicates that most (57.1%) of the head teachers indicated that education system and modes of grading are quite different from country to another. They supported the fact that refugee pupils come from their countries of origin with totally different grading systems which make it difficult for them to fit into the host country’s system of education.
education. This is because it is difficult to establish exactly the level a refugee child was, before he or she left school. Given such a scenario, it becomes very difficult for the education staff in the host country to establish their level of education and they are hence forced to undertake a pre-admission examination to determine which class they should go to. These findings were supported by a record majority (42.9%). The study further revealed that, due to search circumstances, the government policy on recognition of foreign education system negatively affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils. This was supported majority (54.5%) of the head teachers. However, the proportion (43.3%) of head teachers who disagreed and answered on the contrary hold to the view that recognition of foreign education and accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils is affected by several factors among them is the relationship between the host country and the home country with respect to language, ethnicity, and national identity which is often closely related to what type of curriculum the country of origin uses and how the previous and current educational attainment is recognized. The study also established that majority (85.7%) strongly agreed to the fact that language barrier is a hindrance to education and learning opportunities of the refugees. These findings were similar to those established by UNHCR (2004).

The research also elicited the views of the teachers on the effects of recognition of foreign education and accessibility of primary education by refugee pupils. Data was collected and results were as indicated in Table 1.13;
Table 4.13: Teachers’ Views on Recognition of Foreign Education and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading system of refugee pupils’ countries of origin is totally different</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to establish the educational level of refugee pupils and thus they do a pre-admission examination</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers hinder education and learning opportunities for refugees</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of foreign education affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of foreign education does not affect accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=38
Similarly, the data on the table 4.13 above indicates that most (40.9%) of the teachers indicated that education system and modes of grading are quite different from country to another. They supported the fact that refugee pupils come from their countries of origin with totally different grading systems which make it difficult for them to fit into the host country’s system of
education. This is because it is difficult to establish exactly the level a refugee child was, before he or she left school. Given such a scenario, it becomes very difficult for the education staff in the host country to establish their level of education and they are hence forced to undertake a pre-admission examination to determine which class they should go to. These findings were supported by a record majority (50%). The study further revealed that, due to search circumstances, the government policy on recognition of foreign education system negatively affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils. This was supported majority (45.5%) of the teachers. However, the proportion of teachers who answered on the contrary hold to the view that recognition of foreign education and accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils is affected by several factors among them is the relationship between the host country and the home country with respect to language, ethnicity, and national identity which is often closely related to what type of curriculum the country of origin uses and how the previous and current educational attainment is recognized.

Just like in the case of head teachers, the study also established that majority (72.7%) strongly agreed to the fact that language barrier is a hindrance to education and learning opportunities of the refugees. These findings were supported by those from a study carried out in Sierra Leone by UNHCR (2004) which indicated that refugee children and youth, who returned to their country after the war was over, had their education which they had received in the refugee camps not recognized by the Ministry of Education. Despite the
agreement in views of head teachers and teachers on the effects of recognition of foreign education and accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils, there was a glaring disparity in percentages on head teachers’ and teachers’ views. This is attributed to that it is the head teachers who are involved more in the process of registration of refugee children into primary schools than the teachers.

The research also elicited the views of the pupils on the effects of recognition of foreign education and accessibility of primary education by refugee pupils. Data was collected and results were as indicated in Table 1.14;

Table 4.14: Refugee Pupils’ Views on Recognition of Foreign Education and Access to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Items</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were you in school in your previous country?</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have any language problem during transition?</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was your host school able to recognize your academic progress in your country of origin?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you sit for pre-admission examination or started all over again?</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the education systems similar?</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=340
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The data in table 4.14 above indicates that the majority (75.2%) of the refugee pupils revealed that they were in school in their country of origin. A record majority (82.3%) of the refugee pupils indicated that they had language problems during transition. Recognition of foreign refugee pupils’ education documents is affected by several factors. Among them are the relationship between the host country and country of origin with respect to language, ethnicity and national identity is often closely related to what type of curriculum the country of origin uses and how previous and current educational attainment is recognized (Kirk, 2009). On the same breath, majority (77%) of the refugee pupils indicated that they had to start all over again in their studies. An impressive 77% of the refugee pupils indicated that the schools they attended did not recognize their academic progress they had attained from their country of origin. This view was supported by the fact that refugee pupils sit for pre-admission examinations with a record majority (85.8%) responding in favor. Awarding similar documentation can be hindered by both technical issues including differing validation processes across borders and the loss or destruction of such documents during displacement and political issues relating to national sovereignty and corruption
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents summary of main research findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research as discussed under the research objectives.

5.2 Summary of the study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of government policies on Free Primary Education, examination registration policy and recognition of foreign education on refugee pupils’ access to education in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The target population for this study comprised of 17 head teachers from public primary schools with refugee children, 351 teachers from the schools and 3,500 refugee pupils from public primary schools in Kamukunji District. Using The Central Limit Theorem, the researcher sampled 7 head teachers, 40 teachers and 351 refugee pupils which totaled to 398 respondents which was 10.5% of the target population.

5.3 Findings of the study
The study found out that FPE policy on enrolment poses stringent measures for enrolments of refugee pupils. This view was supported a record majority of the respondents. Head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils believe that Free Primary Education (FPE) policies do not adequately cover the refugee’s pupils. An impressive number of head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils
also affirmed the fact that the government’s policy on FPE does not enhance refugee pupils’ accessibility to primary education. This was attributed to the fact that the FPE policy has put stringent rules requiring any pupil to submit a registration certificate as a requirement for refugee children enrolment and this has been a setback on the refugee’s registration to schools. Only paltry proportion respondents indicated that FPE policy is not a hindrance to accessibility to education by refugee pupils. They attribute the challenges to accessibility to poverty which they consider as the stumbling block to the refugee’s accessibility to education and that refugees find it difficult to access education due to the cost of transport, books, uniforms and desks.

On exam registration policy and accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils, the study revealed that most head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils affirm that examination registration policy significantly affects access to primary education by refugee pupils. These findings affirm the fact that documents for original proof of qualification and registration fees are important requirements for refugee and non-refugee pupils to register for examination. This view is supported by an impressive number of teachers and a record majority of the refugee pupils. However, a small proportion of head teachers and teachers did indicate that refugee pupils are discriminated against due to lack of certification documents. This is despite the fact that a sizeable number of refugee pupils believed that they get discriminated against when they lack the pre-requisite documentation to register for examinations.

However, a record number of head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils asserted that examination registration requirements and documentation have
negative effect on accessibility of primary education by refugee pupils. This was attributed to the fact that most of the refugees do not possess these documents such as birth certificates. The study has also revealed that government policy on recognition of foreign education affects the accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils. This was supported majority of the head teachers who acknowledged the fact that education system, modes of grading and certification are quite different from one country to another. They supported the fact that refugee pupils come from their countries of origin with totally different grading systems which make it difficult for them to fit into the host country’s system of education. This is because it is difficult to establish exactly the level a refugee child was, before he or she left school. Given such a scenario, it becomes very difficult for the education staff in the host country to establish their level of education and they are hence forced to undertake a pre-admission examination to determine which class they should go to. This is an exercise which some of the refugee pupils, due to traumatic experience in their countries of origin, may not be psychologically prepared to undertake.

These findings further reveal that, due to search circumstances, the government policy on recognition of foreign education system negatively affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils. This was supported majority of the head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils. However, the proportion of respondents who answered on the contrary hold to the view that recognition of foreign education and accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils is affected by several factors among them is the
relationship between the host country and the home country with respect to language, ethnicity, and national identity which is often closely related to what type of curriculum the country of origin uses and how the previous and current educational attainment is recognized.

5.4 Conclusions

From the foregoing, it is evident that government policies on education affect accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils. It has established that effective implementation of implementation of FPE provides refugee pupils to have equal access and opportunities in education. For the refugees not accessing education, it’s because of personal issues. It has revealed that the refugee children have equal chances and opportunities to examinations, as the pupils of regular citizens. The government policy poses stringent measures which affect the enrolment of refugee pupils. The policy calls for presentation of pre-requisite documents foe enrolments. However, they still are required to have a refugee registration certificate and that it is difficult to recognize the foreign certificates for refugees because of the mismatch of the education syllabus, and the entire education system at large. The study has also established that the language difference between the refugees’ country of origin and Kenyan languages is a big challenge to the continuation of education to the refugee children.

On exam registration, the study has affirmed the fact that documents such as birth certificates and other registration certificates are important requirements for refugee and non-refugee pupils to register for examination. It has also established that refugee pupils come from their countries of origin with totally
different grading systems which make it difficult for them to fit into the host country’s system of education. This is because it is difficult to establish exactly the level a refugee child was, before he or she left school. Given such a scenario, it becomes very difficult for the education staff in the host country to establish their level of education and they are hence forced to undertake a pre-admission examination to determine which class they should go to.

5.5 Recommendations

Drawing from the research findings and conclusions discussed herein, the following recommendations are made:

i) The government should ensure appropriate registration of the refugees and issuing of the appropriate documents for recognition.

ii) The government should deploy teachers who understand the languages of refugee origin, to the schools in areas with many refugees, so as to enhance learning and understanding of the refugee children.

iii) The government should offer funds for school feeding programme to the primary schools so as to relieve the refugees’ families the burden of paying the money for school feeding programme.

iv) The government should organize for seminars and workshops for creating awareness amongst teachers, head teachers and pupils about the existence of Basic Education Act 2013 and its various sections on rights and privileges of every education stakeholder. This is because
most of the respondents were not aware and concerned about The Basic Education Act 2013 and Refugee Education in Kenya.

v) The government should ensure full adherence to the Basic Education Act 2013 by the head teachers to understand that no pupil should be denied admission for lack of registration documents.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

There is need in future that research work is done to investigate the effects of government’s education policy on provision of infrastructure to refugee schools in Kenya.
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LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN YOUR PRIMARY SCHOOL

I am a student undertaking a course in Master of Education in Education-Emergency at University of Nairobi. I am required to submit, as parts of my research work assessment, a research project report on “Effects of Government Policy on Access to Primary Education by Refugee Pupils in Kamukunji District, Nairobi County”. To achieve this, your primary school has been selected to participate in the study. I kindly request the head teachers, teachers and refugee pupils in classes 6 and 7 to, fully, participate in this study. This information would be used purely for academic purpose and your name would not be mentioned in the report. Findings of the study, shall upon request, be availed to you.

Your assistance and cooperation would be highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Rachel Mweru Gitau
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

The following questionnaire is designed to gather information on factors that affect refugee pupils access primary education in kamukunji district Nairobi county. Kindly give the information required as honestly as possible. Do not write your name on this questionnaire since your identity will be kept Confidential.

Section A: Demographic Information

Please tick (√) the appropriate answers

1. What is your Gender?
   Male ☐       Female ☐

2. What is your Age?
   20-30 years ☐
   31-40 years ☐
   41-50 years ☐
   Over 50 years ☐

3. What is your highest Academic Qualifications?
   Diploma in Education. ☐
   Bachelors Degree ☐
   B.SC/BA with PGDE ☐
   Master Degree ☐
   PhD ☐
4. For how long have you been a teacher?

1 – 3 years □
4 – 6 years □
7 – 9 years □
10-12 years □
Over 12 years □

Section B. Government policy on FPE and Access to Education by Refugee Pupils

1. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policy on FPE Factors affecting the School Attendance of Refugees in Public Primary Schools, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD).

Please tick (✓) against each statement your best opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The policy guidelines are not clear on the refugees children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education policies do not adequately cover the refugees children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are here illegally and so they fear taking their children to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Registration certificate is a requirement for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refugee children enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The FPE policy hinders on refugee pupils’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessibility to education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The FPE policy do not hinder refugee pupils’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessibility to education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. State any other government policy factors affecting the attendance of refugee’s children in primary schools

Section C: Examination Registration and Access to Education by Refugee Pupils

1. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policies on Education Opportunities for Refugees Children, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD). Please tick (✓) against each statement your best opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Documentation for proof of qualification and registration fees are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirements for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Refugees are discriminated against due to lack of exam registration documents

3. Examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils

4. Examination registration policy does not affect accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils

2. State any other Government Policy on Education Opportunities for Refugees Children

…………………………………………………………………………...
…………………………………………………………………………

Section D: Recognition of Foreign Education and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

1. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policies on Recognition of Foreign Education and Academic Certificates Awarded to the Refugees, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD). Please tick (√) against each statement your best opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Grading system of refugee pupils’ countries of origin is totally different

2. It is difficult to establish the educational level of refugee pupils and thus they do a pre-admission examination

3. Language barriers hinder education and learning opportunities for refugees

4. Recognition of foreign education affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils

5. Recognition of foreign education does not affect accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils

---

2. State any other Government Policy on Recognition of Foreign Education and Academic Certificates Awarded to the Refugees

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

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

Section E. Government Strategies Improve on Refugees’ Education

1. Suggest the Strategies that the Government should employ to improve on Refugees pupils’ accessibility to Education

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

........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX III
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The following questionnaire is designed to gather information on factors that affect refugee pupils access primary education in kamukunji district Nairobi county. Kindly give the information required as honestly as possible. Do not write your name on this questionnaire since your identity will be kept Confidential.

Section A: Demographic Information

Please tick (✓) the appropriate answers.

1. What is your Gender?
   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. What is your Age?
   20-30 years ☐
   31-40 years ☐
   41-50 years ☐
   Over 50 years ☐

3. What is your highest Academic Qualifications?
   Diploma in Education. ☐
   Bachelors Degree ☐
   B.SC/BA with PGDE ☐
   Master Degree ☐
   PhD ☐
4. For how long have you been a teacher?

1 – 3 years  
4 – 6 years  
7 – 9 years  
10-12 years  
Over 12 years

Section B. Free Primary Education and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

1. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policy on FPE Factors affecting the School Attendance of Refugees in Public Primary Schools, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD). Please tick (✓) against each statement your best opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The policy guidelines are not clear on the refugees children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education policies do not adequately cover the refugees children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most of the refugees in Kamukunji District are here illegally, so they fear taking children to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C: Examination Registration and Access to Education by Refugee Pupils

3. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policies on Education Opportunities for Refugees Children, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD). Please tick (✓) against each statement your best opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Documentation for proof of qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and registration fees are requirements for examination registration

2. Refugees are discriminated against due to lack of exam registration documents

3. Examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils

4. Examination registration policy does not affect accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils


………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Section D: Recognition of Foreign Education and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Education

2. Please indicate to the statements about the Government Policies on Recognition of Foreign Education and Academic Certificates Awarded to the Refugees, indicating whether you strongly agree (SA) Agree (A) Undecided (UN), Disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD). Please tick (✓) against each statement your best opinion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grading system of refugee pupils’ countries of origin is totally different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is difficult to establish the educational level of refugee pupils and thus they do a pre-admission examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language barriers hinder education and learning opportunities for refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recognition of foreign education affects accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recognition of foreign education does not affect accessibility to primary education by refugee pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. State any other Government Policy on Recognition of Foreign Education and Academic Certificates Awarded to the Refugees

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

Section E. Government Strategies Improve on Refugees’ Education

1. Suggest the Strategies that the Government should employ to improve on Refugees pupils’ accessibility to Education
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REFUGEE PUPILS

The following questionnaire is designed to gather information on factors that affect refugee pupils access primary education in kamukunji district Nairobi county. Kindly give the information required as honestly as possible. Do not write your name on this questionnaire since your identity will be kept Confidential.

Section A: Background Information

1. Your gender
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Your age in years. .................... Yrs

Section B: Free Primary Education and Refugee Pupils’ Access to Primary Education

1. Are you registered as a refugee officially?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Were you admitted in school with or without the necessary documentation?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
3. During the admission to the school, were you asked for any admission fees?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   If yes, how much? ........................................

4. Is there money paid by the parents to the school, towards your education
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

5. Are your parents able to pay the money to school?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

6. Have you ever been sent home to get money for the school?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. Have you ever been sent home for any school levy?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Section C: Examination Registration Policy and Refugee Pupils' Access to Education

1. Have you ever been asked to produce documentation for proof of qualification to register for examination of any kind?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

2. Have you ever been asked to pay registration fees for any kind of examination?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

3. Have you ever been discriminated against due to lack of exam registration documents?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
4. Do you believe that examination registration policy affects accessibility to primary education amongst refugee pupils?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Section D: Policy on Recognition of Foreign Education and Pupils’ Access to Education

1. When did you arrive in Kenya? .........................

2. Were you in school in your previous country?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

3. Did you have any language problem during transition?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

4. Was your host school able to recognize your academic progress in your country of origin?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

5. Did you sit for pre-admission examination or started all over again?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

6. Are the education systems similar?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Section E: Government Strategies to improve on Refugees Education

1. Explain what do you think can be done to make your learning better?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Comment on what do you think can make those refugee children who do not go to school also be able to attend school?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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