

1     **Influence of Selected Factors on the Choice of Agriculture Subject among**  
2                   **Secondary School Students in Kisii and Nyamira Counties**

3

4     **ABSTRACT**

5     The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of selected factors on the choice of  
6     agriculture subject among secondary school students in Kisii and Nyamira Counties. With the  
7     objective of determining the influence of teachers on the choice of agriculture subject among  
8     students, to determine the influence of gender on the choice of agriculture subject among  
9     students, to explore the extent to which students attitude influence the choice of agriculture  
10    subject and finally to determine whether school finance influence the choice of agriculture  
11    subject among students in secondary schools. A survey methodology was employed to collect  
12    data from students and teachers with the help of a Questionnaire as the instrument for data  
13    collection. The study targeted form four agriculture students and agriculture teachers. Simple  
14    random sampling method was used to sample 330 agriculture students and 18 agriculture  
15    teachers while stratified sampling was used to sample 22 schools. Data from the students and  
16    teachers was analysed using qualitative and quantitative methods. Descriptive statistics  
17    including frequencies, means, as well as, standard deviation was used while inferential  
18    statistics which includes Pearson correlation and t-test was used to test the hypothesis, with  
19    levels of significance set at 0.05. Statistical package for social sciences software version 20  
20    was used for data analysis. The findings of this study show that agriculture teachers have got  
21    influence on student's choice of agriculture subject. The study revealed further that the gender  
22    of the student does not influence the choice of agriculture as a subject neither does the gender  
23    of a teacher influence student's choice of agriculture. Additionally, the positive attitude  
24    exhibited by the students by studying agriculture often and quest to know more has an  
25    influence on choice of agriculture as a subject. Lastly, resources do not influence the choice  
26    of agriculture as a subject. The findings of the study might be useful to parents, teachers and  
27    the ministry of education. The study recommended that principals of schools to monitor  
28    syllabus delivery to ensure that the right content is taught, that career and guidance to be  
29    strengthened in schools for this will create awareness on career opportunities in the job  
30    market and finally ministry of education through the government to provide enough funds to  
31    schools to enable purchase of teaching learning resources.

32    **Keywords:** Agriculture; secondary schools; Kisii and Nyamira Counties; random sampling

33

34

## 35 INTRODUCTION

36

37 Agriculture is the backbone of the Kenyan nation and contributes a lot to its economic  
38 development. The sector contributes about 24 per cent Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and  
39 about 19 percent formal wage employment and guarantees food security to the nation. It  
40 contributes over 60% of exports and provides 80% of all industrial raw materials (KIPPRA,  
41 2009; GOK, 2007).

42 In Kenya agriculture was introduced in 1985 into the curriculum (KICD 2006). The purpose  
43 of offering agriculture to secondary school students was to counter the apparent negative  
44 attitude to farming by many students by providing them with knowledge and skills that will  
45 enable them secure existing opportunities in agriculture hence change their attitude towards  
46 agriculture. In the secondary school curriculum, the subject is grouped with other technical  
47 subjects in group four (KICD 2006). Subjects in this group including agriculture are not  
48 compulsory and students are given a chance to choose the subject they are comfortable with.

49 On the other hand, students face many challenges in the selection of these elective subjects.

50 Hence a need to have many people enter into agriculture-related careers to increase  
51 productivity. Several studies have been done on students' perception, the performance of  
52 agriculture subject, gender, and attitude towards agriculture subject on performance. Some of  
53 them include that of Muchiri, (2013) which deduced that boys did not significantly differ  
54 from girls in their perception of agriculture as a subject of study. Kibett (2014) deduced that  
55 poor teaching methods are attributed to poor performance. Another study by Chambers *et al*  
56 (2004) also concluded that gender does not influence academic performance. Constantino  
57 Pedzisai (2014), Castejon and Perez (2000) also in their study deduced that student's negative  
58 attitude towards a particular subject depends on the method of teaching. The table below  
59 shows KCSE candidature enrolment over the last eight years.

60 **Table 1.KCSE Candidate’s enrolment nationally, 2004-2012.**

61	Year	Total KCSE	Agriculture	Percentage.
62	Candidature.	Enrolment.		
63	2004	222676	98760	44
64	2005	263665	106169	40
65	2006	243453	107068	44
66	2007	276239	121193	44
67	2009	337404	137217	41
68	2010	357488	140237	39
69	2011	411783	167709	41
70	2012	436349	178484	41

71 **Source: KNEC reports, 2004-2012.**

72 According to KNEC reports (2004-2012) the number of students taking the subject has  
 73 increased but at a very low percentage which means that the subject has not yet gained  
 74 popularity. The literature available is inconclusive on the major factors influencing choice of  
 75 agriculture as a subject of study. It was therefore upon this background that the study sought  
 76 to investigate the factors which affect the choice of agriculture as a subject among secondary  
 77 school students in both Kisii and Nyamira counties with emphasis on teachers, gender,  
 78 student’s attitude and school finance.

79

80 **LITERATURE REVIEW**

81 The influence of teachers on students' choice of subject in any institution is paramount since  
82 students **rely on** teachers advice on subject choice. This means that, teachers should be good  
83 role models at all times since students imitate them in all that they do. Education is one of the  
84 most effective development investment a country can make since it is recognized globally. It  
85 is one of the critical pathways to promote social and economic development World Bank  
86 (2007). It enables the development of better life and world by raising the economy, reducing  
87 fertility rate, infant and maternal mortality, improves livelihood of families, and better  
88 education for children Gachukia (1999).

89 According to the Chief Examiner's Report in 2010 on Agriculture Science, it showed that  
90 students have ignored the fundamentals of agriculture and knowledge of practical agriculture  
91 (West Africa Examination Council [WAEC], 2010). It further indicated that most students  
92 were unable to perform simple experiments.

93 Shiundu and Omulando (1992) revealed that technical and vocational education has been  
94 receiving a negative attitude by a large section of the Kenyan community yet JICA (2008)  
95 reports that, technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) is considered as a strong  
96 vehicle for social and economic development in most countries. A study by Gross et al (1971)  
97 indicated that when teachers have a positive attitude towards an innovation they will spend  
98 more time and efforts to ensure that it is fully implemented. The research is useful to this  
99 study to determine whether teachers have an influence on the choice of agriculture subject  
100 among students.

101 Onwuka, (1981) argues that the role of a teacher is very important when it comes to  
102 imparting knowledge and skills to learners. The method of teaching he/she uses to present the  
103 subject matter is very vital since it may make the learner like or dislike a subject. Therefore it  
104 is very important that a secondary school teacher should be academically knowledgeable in

105 his area of specialization because lack of the skills to impart knowledge may cause students  
106 to make wrong subject choices that might lead to failure in their exams.

107 Despite the importance of agriculture in Kenya's economy, the academic achievement of  
108 secondary school students in agriculture is generally poor. According to the Kenya National  
109 Examinations Council (2013), the students mean scores in the subject were less than 50 per  
110 cent for the years 2007-2012 as shown in **Table 2.**

111

112 **Table 2. KCSE Agriculture subject Analysis**

Year	No of candidates	Mean score (%)
2007	121,193	48.52
2008	134,039	37.27
2009	137,217	43.15
2010	140,237	37.76
2012	167,709	41.29
2013	178,419	38.87

113 **Source: KNEC, 2013.**

114 Good teaching methods should provide the learners with information to be used now or in  
115 the future as well as guide learners to tackle problems Kibett (2014). Poor performance is  
116 attributed to poor teaching methods but this study will determine whether teachers attitude  
117 towards agriculture subject has an influence on the choice of the subject by students.

118 Gender differences have become on the hotlist of critical issues around the world. Hausmann  
119 et al (2009) argue that the issue of equality between men and women in the world still  
120 remains a challenge since there is no country in the world that has yet attained it in terms of  
121 economic participation or education.

122

123 World Bank, (2005) reports that gender issue is still prevalent in all aspects of life and this is  
124 seen in textbooks and teachers' attitudes when assigning roles to students whereby boys and  
125 girls are assigned different roles according to their ability as perceived by the teachers.

126 Student's personal characteristics have a big role to play when it comes to subject choice  
127 under group four which are technically oriented. This calls in for proper guidance from  
128 teachers on career choice and future career perspective on the subject area.

129 According to Jegede (2001) in his study on student's attitude and how it affects academic  
130 performance found out that, there is a positive relationship between students' attitude and  
131 their performance in academics. This then clearly indicates that student's attitude towards a  
132 certain subject whether positive or negative determines the academic outcome. This study  
133 will investigate the extent to which student attitude influence the choice of agriculture  
134 subject.

135

136 **METHODOLOGY.**

### 137 **Population of study**

138 The population of the study consisted of 9380 students. The target population of the study  
139 was 1100 form four agriculture students and 74 agriculture teachers.

### 140 **Sample and sampling procedures.**

141 Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) assert that a representative sample is one which is between  
142 10% and 30% of the target population for the descriptive survey studies. Hence this study  
143 adopted 30% of the target population as a sample size. The sample size was 330 form four  
144 students of agriculture and 22 teachers of agriculture. Simple random sampling was used to  
145 identify 5 sub-counties out of 9 within Kisii County and 2 out of 5 within Nyamira County.  
146 Stratified random sampling was used to identify 4 schools per Sub County in Kisii County  
147 that gave a total of 20 schools and 2 schools from 1 Sub County in Nyamira giving a total of

148 22 schools. Stratified random sampling was again used to identify students from each  
 149 category as National, extra-county, county, and sub county schools who were categorized  
 150 into three groups as, very bright (5) bright, (5) and not very bright (5) making a total of 15  
 151 students.

152 **Table 3: Sample size determination.**

Nature of school	No. of students	No. of teachers	Total
<b>Kisii and Nyamira</b>	<b>15 per school</b>		
National 4 schools	60	4	64
Extra county 5 schools	75	5	80
County 6 schools	90	6	96
Sub county 7 schools	105	7	112
Total = 22 schools	330	22	352

153  
 154  
 155

156 **4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

157

158 **Number of Student Taking Agriculture in Form Four**

159 The study sought to find out a number of students taking agriculture in form four. The results  
 160 are presented in **Table 4.**

161 **Table 4 Students taking agriculture in form four**

Number	Frequency	Percentage
20-30	8	44.4

30-40	3	16.7
Above 40	7	38.7
Total	18	100

162

163 The study realized that most (44.4%) student taking agriculture is 20-30 in number while  
 164 38.7% are above 40 in number. Only 16.7% are 30-40 in number. The findings are as a result  
 165 of most counties and sub county schools have few numbers of schools enrolled as opposed to  
 166 national and extra county schools were numbers are relatively high. The findings again are in  
 167 agreement with KNEC 2004-2012 on low enrolment of students in agriculture subject which  
 168 can be attributed to negative attitude.

169 **Influence of Teachers on the Choice of Agriculture Subject among Students in**  
 170 **Secondary Schools**

171 **Table 5: Student response on teacher's influence on the choice of Agriculture**

Attributes	Responses										Mean	SD
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree			
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%		
The teacher influenced my choice of subjects	66	32.6	80	39.8	19	9.6	16	8	20	10	<b>2.22</b>	<b>1.36</b>
Lesson attendance by the teachers influence subject	103	51.8	57	28.6	13	6.5	14	7	12	5.9	<b>1.87</b>	<b>1.18</b>



choice												
Teachers gender influence subject choice	32	15.8	38	18.7	5	2.5	56	27.6	72	35.5	<b>3.48</b>	<b>1.513</b>
Teacher who teaches well influences subject choice	90	43.49	75	39.9	12	6.4	8	4.3	3	1.6	<b>1.67</b>	<b>1.2</b>

172

173 Data contained in **Table 5** revealed that 72.4% of the students agreed that teachers influenced  
 174 their choice of agriculture subject, 9.6% were neutral, and 18% disagreed. This is an  
 175 indication that most students follow what their teachers do in choosing a subject with a mean  
 176 of 2.22 and standard deviation 1.36

177 Another influencing factor shown by the data was that regular and timely attendance to  
 178 lessons by teachers influence choice of the subject shown by (80.4%). This is clearly  
 179 indicated with a mean of 1.87 that shows strong agreement, a standard deviation 1.18 shows  
 180 there is little differences in responses from the responses to mean value of the strong  
 181 agreement. The implication of this is that the majority of the respondents are influenced by  
 182 regular attendance of lessons by the teacher. The significance of this information for this  
 183 study is that regular attendance of lessons by a teacher influences students when it comes to  
 184 decision making on the choice of subjects. A (63.3%) majority of students disagreed that the  
 185 gender of teachers influenced their choice of subject. This is further adduced by the mean  
 186 rejection of 3.48 with a standard deviation of 1.5. Only 34.5 agreed that the gender of the  
 187 teacher influenced their choice of agriculture. A good number of students 83.4% of students  
 188 agreed that they were influenced to do Agriculture because their agriculture teachers taught

189 well. This was further evidenced by the mean response of 1.6 with a standard deviation of  
190 1.2. 5.95 did not agree with it.

191 **4.11: Relationship between Student and Agriculture Teacher**

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	106	52.7
Good	71	35.3
Neutral	14	7.0
Satisfactory	4	2.0
Very poor	6	3.0
Total	204	100

192

193 From the table above majority, 88% of the students have a good relationship with their  
194 teachers. The good relationship is key to enhancing curriculum delivery and teaching.

195

196 **Table 6: Teachers response on Influence of Career Guidance on Choice of Agriculture**

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very great extent	7	38.9
Great extent	10	55.6
Moderate	1	5.6
Total	18	100

197

198 From **table 6** above, Most (94.4%) teachers agreed that career guidance influences choice of  
199 agriculture as a subject in most secondary schools to a great extent. It opens up students to

200 future opportunities and aspirations that make students be more focused on building their  
 201 future aspirations and ambitions.

202

203

204 **Table 7: Teachers response to factors that have led to students taking Agriculture in**  
 205 **secondary schools in Nyamira and Kisii counties**

206

Statements on student choice.	Rating						
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	
Those good in Biology.	f	0	0	0	9	5	14
	%	0	0	0	64.3	35.7	100
Previous performance in Agriculture is good	f	0	0	3	9	3	15
	%	0	0	20	60	20	100
Those who have been guided on different careers	f	0	0	1	6	7	14
	%	0	0	7.1	43.9	50	100
Those with general good performance.	f	0	0	2	4	9	15
	%	0	0	13.	26.7	60	100
			3				

207 **Key:** SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A =Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

208

209 Data captured in **Table 7 indicated** that (100%) of teachers agreed that those students who do  
 210 well in Biology have chosen Agriculture as their technical subject. This was further  
 211 elaborated by the majority (80%) of teachers who indicated that students whose previous  
 212 performance in agriculture was good chose the subject. Further, it was established that 93.9%  
 213 of students chose Agriculture because they were guided well on career choices. Lastly, 82.7%

214 agreed that students with generally good performance have taken agriculture to boost their  
 215 scores.

216 **4.14: Teachers response to factors that have led to students choice of Agriculture in**  
 217 **secondary schools in Nyamira and Kisii counties**

218 The study sought to establish the teacher's response on the factors that have led to students  
 219 choice of agriculture subject. Their views were shown in the **Table 8.**

220

221 **Table 8: Teachers response on teacher influence on choice of agriculture**

222

Teaching Methodsj	Rating						Total
	SD	D	N	A	SA		
Lecture.	f	4	2	0	6	1	13
	%	30.8	15.4	0	46.2	7.6	100
Field trips.	f	1	0	0	10	3	14
	%	7.1	0	0	71.4	21.4	100
Demonstrations.	f	0	0	0	7	10	17
	%	0	0	0	41.2	58.8	100
Discussions.	f	0	0	0	1	13	14
	%	0	0	0	7.1	92.9	100
Group work.	f	0	0	0	5	9	14
	%	0	0	0	35.7	64.3	100
Drilling using past papers.	f	6	2	0	6	0	14
	%	42.9	14.4	0	42.9	0	100
Projects.	f	0	2	0	8	4	14
	%	0	14.3	0	57.1	28.6	100

223

224 **Table 8** indicates that the method used by the teachers to teach influences choice of  
225 Agriculture subject. It was realized that most teachers use discussions (100%), group work  
226 (100%), demonstrations (100%) and field trips(100%) to influence a student to do agriculture.  
227 Other methods which are used include lecture (53.2%), projects (85.1%) and drilling of past  
228 examinations (42.9%). Most teachers indicated that the friendly teaching methods they  
229 employ make students get attracted to choose Agriculture subject for study.

#### 230 **4.4 Influence of Gender on the Choice of Agriculture Subject among Students in** 231 **Secondary Schools.**

232 In this part of analysis gender's influence was measured by several factors and its influence  
233 on the choice of Agriculture as a subject. A five point Likert type scale ranging from Strongly  
234 Agree = 1 that indicates very high, Agree = 2 that indicates high, Neutral = 3 that indicates  
235 moderate, Disagree = 4 that indicates low, and Strongly Disagree = 5 indicates very low. The  
236 tables below depict the frequency distribution of teachers influence:

237

#### 238 **Table 9: influence of gender on choice of subject**

239

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	64	31.4
No	140	68.6
Total	204	100

240

241 Most of the students who were interviewed, 68.6% said taking agriculture as a subject was  
242 not influenced by their gender. While 31.4% indicated that their gender influenced them to  
243 take agriculture

244

245

246

**Table 10: Gender \* influence of gender on the choice of subjects Crosstabulation**

			Did your gender influence choice of subjects		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender Male	Count		31	84	115
	% within Gender		27.0%	73.0%	100.0%
	% within Did your gender influence choice of subjects		48.4%	60.4%	56.7%
	% of Total		15.3%	41.4%	56.7%
Female	Count		33	55	88
	% within Gender		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	% within Did your gender influence choice of subjects		51.6%	39.6%	43.3%
	% of Total		16.3%	27.1%	43.3%
Total	Count		64	139	203
	% within Gender		31.5%	68.5%	100.0%
	% within Did your gender influence choice of subjects		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		31.5%	68.5%	100.0%

247

248

249 Majority of the students' interviewed (41.4%) and 27.1 % of males and females respectively  
 250 indicated they did not choose agriculture because of their gender. Only 15.35% of males and  
 251 16.3% of females chose agriculture because of their gender. This is contrary to Werunga et al  
 252 (2013) in a study on factors influencing choice of technical subjects among the secondary  
 253 school graduates in Kenya found out that gender influenced the choice of subject.

254

255

**Table 11** Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	P value	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.567 <sup>a</sup>	1	0.109	0.128	0.074
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	2.102	1	0.147		
Likelihood Ratio	2.556	1	0.110		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.554	1	0.110		
N of Valid Cases	203				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

256 According to Chi-square table above gender did not influence the choice of agriculture  
 257 subject . Pearson chi-square=0.109, continuity correction =0.147, likelihood ratio=0.110 and  
 258 linear-by-linear association=0.110, these values are greater than0.05 indicating clearly that  
 259 gender did not influence agriculture choice among students in Kisii and Nyamira counties.  
 260 Most students who objected gender influenced their choice of agriculture indicated that  
 261 agriculture is the best alternative in the career world and is meant for all students

262

263 **4.5 The influence of Students attitude towards the choice of agriculture subject in**  
264 **secondary schools.**

265 The third research question was to investigate whether a student's attitude influenced the  
266 choice of agriculture subject in secondary schools in Nyamira and Kisii Counties. **Table 11**  
267 summarizes the responses of students on factors that influenced their choice of agriculture

268

269 **Table 12: Factors that Influenced the Choice of Agriculture**

Item	Frequency	Percentage
The subject is interesting	45	22
Good previous performance	15	7.3
Career goals require agriculture	130	63.4
My friend chose agriculture	3	1.5
My agriculture teacher was inspiring in form 1 and 2	10	4.9
Total	204	100

270

271 Agriculture students who were interviewed (63.4%) indicated that career goals that require  
272 agriculture made them choose the subject, (22%) indicated that agriculture is an interesting  
273 subject, 7.3% said the good previous performance made them choose agriculture, 4.9%  
274 indicated their agriculture teachers were inspiring inform one and two prior to subject  
275 selection in form three. Lastly, 1.5% chose agriculture because their friends had decided to do  
276 agriculture. This clearly shows that career opportunities require relevant skills for one to be  
277 able to compete favourably in the job market today.



278 The students were asked to indicate why they did not enjoy agriculture subject in the  
 279 school. **Table 13** shows the responses

**Table 13.** Reason for not enjoying agriculture lessons

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Teacher does not explain well	10	4.9	50.0	50.0
Teacher is too slow	1	.5	5.0	55.0
Teacher dictates very fast	8	3.9	40.0	95.0
Teacher is harsh	1	.5	5.0	100.0
Total	20	9.8	100.0	

280 Most students indicated that they do not enjoy agriculture because the agriculture teacher  
 281 does not explain agriculture concepts well (50%).This concurs with Egbule (2004) in his  
 282 study that, every agriculture teacher must be effective in teaching, be professional, focused,  
 283 innovative, and be concern about the student's welfare. This will make learners like the  
 284 subject and choose it for study.

285 Teacher dictates agriculture notes very fast (40%), the teacher is very harsh (5%) and the  
 286 teacher is very slow(5%).This could also lead to poor academic performance of the subject.

287 **Table 14:** Level of language Used during Agriculture lessons

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very Simple	49	24
Simple	84	41.2
Moderate	66	32.4
Difficult	1	0.5
Confusing	4	2
Total	204	100

288

289 Most of the students who were interviewed, 65.2% indicated that the language used in  
 290 teaching agriculture is simple for one to comprehend the content delivered by the teacher in  
 291 class. This agrees with Curran and Rosen (2003) that students prefer subjects that are taught  
 292 by teachers who are enthusiastic, well spoken, knowledgeable, caring, and helpful as opposed  
 293 to instructors who are dry, inflexible, and unclear for they do not encourage students to take  
 294 the subject for study.

295 **Sixty-six out of 204 or 32.4% of the students** said the language is moderate and 2.5% said it  
 296 is difficult and confusing. Agriculture is one of the technical subjects taught in secondary  
 297 schools, hence the simple language used by teachers makes it easier for the students to  
 298 comprehend and understand the subject and pass.

299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Very great extent	10	55.6	55.6
a great extent	8	44.4	100.0
Total	18	100.0	

305

306 Most teachers agreed that student attitude influences choice of Agriculture as a subject.

307 55.6% of the teachers agreed that attitude affects choice of agriculture to a very great extent

308 while 44.4% indicated it is to a great extent. This agrees with Ozioma C.A.zubuike (2011)  
 309 and Ordhoet *al* (2013) concluded that student attitude towards the subject affects academic  
 310 performance. The significance of this information for this study is that student’s attitude plays  
 311 a major role in the learning process more especially when it is positive the results are good  
 312 compared to the negative attitude that leads to poor results. Hence should be positive always

313 **Table 15: Teachers Perception on how Students perceive Agriculture**

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very ease	4	26.7
Ease	6	40.0
Moderate	5	33.3
Total	15	100

314  
 315  
 316 Majority of the students who were interviewed, 66.7% perceives agriculture as an easy  
 317 subject hence chose it for study while only 33.3% take it as a moderate subject. This concurs  
 318 with Chemjor J.Esther (2016) in a study on factors influencing choice of agriculture subject  
 319 by students in Kajiado County that students chose the subject because they have a positive  
 320 attitude towards it. Agriculture is considered as an easy subject because much of the content  
 321 involves practical work that enables students to comprehend concepts faster and excel in  
 322 examinations.

323  
 324 **Table 16: Teachers' Response on the Reasons Why Most Students are Doing**  
 325 **Agriculture in Secondary Schools in Nyamira and Kisii Counties**

Statements on taking Agriculture.	Rating						
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Previous academic achievement.	f	0	0	0	5	4	9
	%	0	0	0	55.6	44.4	100
Student individual interest.	f	0	0	0	6	5	11
	%	0	0	0	54.5	45.6	100
Career prospects.	f	0	0	1	6	2	9
	%	0	0	11	66.7	22.2	100
Peer group influence.	f	91	70	26	44	29	260
	%	35	27	10	17	11	100
Study habits.	f	19	38	57	29	67	260
	%	7	15	22	11	26	100
Dedicate most time in studying Agriculture.	f	36	31	42	65	86	260
	%	14	12	16	25	33	100
Lack concentration.	f	31	26	36	75	91	260
	%	12	10	14	29	35	100
Student only study during examinations.	f	86	91	31	18	34	260
	%	33	35	12	7	13	100

326

327 Most students have taken agriculture because of previous academic achievement (100%),  
328 their interest is catered in agriculture (100%), This indicates that students have a positive  
329 attitude towards the subject and chose it for study which concurs with Jegede (2001) in his  
330 study on student's attitude and how it affects academic performance and concluded that, there  
331 is a positive relationship between students' attitude and their performance in academics. This  
332 then clearly indicates that student's attitude towards a certain subject whether positive or

333 negative determines the academic outcome. Career prospects(89%), peer group influence  
 334 (28%), study habits(37%), most students dedicate most of their time studying agriculture  
 335 (58%) while most teachers disagreed that most students study only during examinations  
 336 (68%).

337 **4.6Influence of School finance on the Choice of Agriculture Subject among Students in**  
 338 **Secondary Schools**

339 The fourth research question was to investigate whether School finance influenced the choice  
 340 of agriculture subject among students in secondary schools in Nyamira and Kisii County.

341 Table below show the responses of students on school finance on the influence of their choice  
 342 of agriculture subject.

343

**Table 17: Students Response Whether Enough or lack of school finance to purchase learning materials influence subject choice**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Agree	42	21.1
Agree	69	34.7
Neutral	25	12.6
Disagree	41	20.6
Strongly Disagree	22	11.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100</b>

345

346 55.8% of the students agreed that the resources allocated to purchase of teaching-learning  
 347 materials were fairly inadequate. This is an implication that topics that require  
 348 demonstrations become abstract to students during teaching. This is in line with Waliki *et al*  
 349 (2009) in his study on factors that affect performance among students and concluded that

350 inadequate physical facilities affect performance. This clearly shows that resources are not  
 351 adequate to purchase learning materials.12.6% remained neutral and 31.7% disagreed.

352

353 **Table 18: Student response on whether enough classrooms in school influence choice of**  
 354 **Agriculture as a subject**

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15	7.5
Agree	35	17.5
Neutral	13	6.5
Disagree	77	38.5
Strongly Disagree	59	29.5
Total	204	100

355 Most of the students with 68% disagreed that they chose agriculture because there were  
 356 enough classrooms in schools to cater for all students. This agrees with Waliki *et al* (2009) in  
 357 his study on factors that affect performance among students concluded that inadequate  
 358 physical facilities, lack of instructional materials, and resources affected performance. This  
 359 is again contrary to Olutola (1982) that availability of enough infrastructures in schools  
 360 contributes to good academic performance as they enhance effective teaching-learning  
 361 activities. A total of 6.5% were neutral while 25% agreed that the classrooms are adequate to  
 362 cater for their learning. Classrooms are important since they facilitate teaching and learning  
 363 in schools. This means that students are encouraged to learn when there are enough rooms for  
 364 use

**Table 19: Student Response on the Extent to which Enough Support Staff in School Influenced their Choice of Agriculture as a Subject**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
To a very great extent	43	40.2
Great extent	33	30.8
Moderate Extent	24	22.4
Little extent	2	2.0
No extent	5	4.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100</b>

365 Out of one hundred and seven respondents, 71% indicated that the subordinate staff to a great  
366 extent influenced their choice of agriculture subject, 22.4% were moderately influenced while

367 2% were little influenced and 4% were not influenced. Subordinate staff like laboratory  
 368 technician who assists by providing them with learning materials when needed. The clerk and  
 369 store keeper also assist students on their day-to –day operations at the school hence their  
 370 influence on the choice of agriculture subject.

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379 **Table 20:** Teacher level of Agreement on the Influence of Financial Resources on the  
 380 **Choice of Agriculture by Students in Secondary Schools in Kisii and Nyamira Counties**

Statements on financial Resources.	Rating						Total
	SD	D	N	A	SA		
Agricultural laboratory.	F	2	2	0	4	3	11
	%	18.1	18.1	0	36.4	27.4	100
School Farm.	F	1	2	0	6	3	12
	%	8.3	16.7	0	50	25	100
Insufficient fund to purchase agricultural equipment	F	0	1	0	7	2	10
	%	0	10	0	70	20	100

381

382 Most of the teachers who were interviewed 90% indicated that there are insufficient funds to  
 383 purchase agricultural equipment which affects choice of Agriculture by students. This  
 384 concurs with Kiadese (2011) on the performance of agriculture found out that problems such



385 as poor school infrastructure, lack of qualified teachers, poorly equipped workshops and  
386 laboratories as well as parents' attitudes affect the teaching of prevocational subjects like  
387 Agriculture. Those who said that school farm influence choice of the subject was (75%). This  
388 agrees with Kabugi (2013) that school farm influences the choice of the subject. Further,  
389 most teachers disagreed that agricultural laboratory influences choice of Agriculture by  
390 students hence did not have any effect on the choice of subject. This is due to the fact that  
391 most schools do not have agricultural laboratories where students carry out practical lessons.  
392 Hence does not influence their choice of subject.

393

## 394 **CONCLUSIONS**

395

396 Teachers influence on the choice of agriculture subject, the study concluded that teachers  
397 have a great influence on student's choice of agriculture as a subject in schools. This is  
398 through regular and timely attendance to lessons by teachers which influence the choice of  
399 subject. On the other hand, teachers' detailed explanation of the content makes learners grasp  
400 concepts faster and this influence subject choice. On the other hand, teachers who are friendly  
401 in guiding them on career opportunities available also influence students on subject choice.  
402 Further, the study revealed that students perceive agriculture as an easy subject and appealing  
403 to most students and this influences them to choose the subject for study.

404 Based on the findings of objective two, on gender influence on the choice of agriculture, it  
405 was concluded that gender of the student does not influence the choice of agriculture as a  
406 subject. Neither does the gender of a teacher influence students' choice of agriculture. This  
407 was clear in the study that students do not choose agriculture because of their gender or that  
408 of the teacher. But they had a positive attitude towards the subject.

409 Based on the findings of objective three, on students' attitude on the choice of agriculture, the  
410 study concluded that individual interest of students towards the subject was positive and this

411 was exhibited by regular studies that students do, and quest to know more has an influence to  
412 the choice of agriculture as a subject.

413 Lastly, based on the findings of objective four, on the influence of school resources on the  
414 choice of agriculture subject, the study revealed that resources do not influence the choice of  
415 agriculture as a subject as most schools do not have adequate financial resources that support  
416 agriculture.

### 417 REFERENCES

- 418 Castejon, J. a. (1998). Casual -explicative model. *Psycho-Social variables in academic*  
419 *performance*, 50 (2), 171-185.
- 420 Chambers, E. S., & J.B. (2004). Girls' academic achievement varying associations of extra  
421 curricular activities. *Gender and education*, 16 (3), 327-346.
- 422 Chandran, E. (2004). Research methods: A quantitative Technique:.
- 423 Clark, H. (2002). Clark, Building Education: The role of the physical environment in  
424 enhancing teaching and research, institute of Education. 30-34.
- 425 Cooney, T. (1990). Learning to Teach. *McGraw, Hill, c.o* .
- 426 Deemer, S. (2004). Classroom goal orientation in high school classrooms: Revealing links  
427 between teacher beliefs and classroom environments,. *Educational Research*, 46 (1), 73-90.
- 428 Dorsey, B. (1996). Academic women at the university of zimbambwe. *Career prospects,*  
429 *aspirations and family role constraints*, 13 (8), 10-18.
- 430 Earthman, G. (2004). Prioritization of 31 criteria for school Building Adequacy.
- 431 Egbule, P. (2004). Fundamentals and practice of agricultural education.
- 432 Egunsola, A. (2014). Influence of Home environment on Academic performance of  
433 Agricultural science in Adamawa state Nigeria. *Journal of Research and Methods*, 4 (4), 46-  
434 53.
- 435 Eshiwani, G. (2001). *Enhancing female participation and performance in mathematics,*  
436 *science and information technology in University education in Kenya: Intervention*  
437 *strategies*.
- 438 Federal Republic of Nigeria, F. (1994). Blueprint on family support programme. Lagos.

- 439 Felder, R. a. (1994). Gender differences in student performance and attitudes. A longitudinal  
 440 study of Engineering student performance and retention. North Carolina University, Report  
 441 NO.NCSU-94A.(ED368553).
- 442 Fisher, K. (2001). Better outcomes: The impact of school infrastructure on student outcomes  
 443 and behaviour, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (Australia).
- 444 Gachukia, E. (1999). Accelerating the Education of Girls and women in sub-Saharan Africa.  
 445 *FAW New magazine*, 7 (2), 5-11.
- 446 Gazi, T. (2008). *Education in Bangladesh*.
- 447 Gliem, J. G. (2003). Interpreting and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for  
 448 Likert-Type Scales. Research to practice conference in Adult continuing and community  
 449 education.
- 450 Good, T. B. (1995). *Contemporary educational psychology* (5 ed.). New York; Longman.
- 451 Gordon, R. (1995). Educational policy and gender in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Educational*  
 452 *Research*. 13 (8), 10-18.
- 453 Government of Kenya. (2009). *Economic Survey*. Nairobi: Government printer.
- 454 Government of Kenya. (2009). Kisii South development plan 2008-2012. *Economic Survey* .
- 455 Government of Kenya, (GOK, 2009). (n.d.). Ministry of agriculture farm management  
 456 guidelines for Kisii South District. Nairobi: Government printer.
- 457 Gross, e. (1971). *Implementing organisational innovation. Sociological Analysis of planned*  
 458 *education change*. New York: Basic Books .
- 459 Gump, P. (1987). *School and classroom environments*, in D. Stockol and I. Altman (eds),  
 460 *Handbook of environmental psychology*.
- 461 Harman, D. (2004). Improving test performance among culturally diverse gifted students.
- 462 Hausmann, R. T. (2009). The global gender gap report.
- 463 Hurley, T., & Pitamber, S. (2009). Gender socialization in the Home and its impact on Boys'  
 464 Achievement in primary and secondary schools. Seychellen: African Development Bank.
- 465 Husen, T. a. (1994). *The international Encyclopedia of Education*. Pergamoni Press.
- 466
- 467 Mhundu, T. (2007). Mitigating gender typed occupational preferences of Zimbabwean  
 468 primary school children. *The use of biographical sketches and portrayals of female role*  
 469 *modes, sex roles* , 639-649.

470 Njoroge, D., Mwangi, P. J., & Udoto, D. M. (2014). Influence Of Young Farmers' Club Of  
 471 Kenya Activities On Secondary School Students' Performance In Kenya Certificate Of  
 472 Secondary Education Agriculture in Rongai Sub-County Of Nakuru County, Kenya. *IOSR*  
 473 *Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 4 (6), 15-35.

474 Njoroge, K. T., & Orodho, J. A. (2014). Secondary school student's perception towards  
 475 agriculture subject in public secondary schools in nairobi county,kenya. *19* (7), 30-36.

476 Nyagura L, R. A. (1994). What causes differences in achievement in Zimbabwean  
 477 secondary school? *policy research and external affairs* .

478 Nyangi, M. (2012). Factors that influence the trend of students enrolment in home science in  
 479 Nairobi secondary schools.

480 Nyangi, M. (n.d.). Factors that influence the trend of students enrolment in home science in  
 481 Nairobi secondary schools.

482 Nziramasanga, C. (1999). *Presidential commission of inquiry into Education and training*.  
 483 Harare: Government printer.

484 Ogunlade, I. (n.d.). Utilizing school farm for rapid agricultural recovery. *Amultisectional*  
 485 *participation paper* .

486 Ogweno, P. O., Nephath, J., & Obara, J. (2014). Influence of family characteristics on  
 487 academic performance of students in secondary agriculture in Rachuonyo North sub county,  
 488 kenya.

489 Olutola, A. (1982). School planning and maintenance introduction to educational planning.

490 Omaren, A. (1998). Characteristics of High School Learners. *Education journal*, 1 (4), 112-  
 491 117.

492 Ongang'a, P. A., & J.J.O, K. (2014). Influence of selected factors on the choice of agriculture  
 493 subject among secondary school students in uriri sub-county, kenya. *Humanities And Social*  
 494 *Science.*, 19 (7), 30-36.

495 Ongeti, K. (1986). Attitudes of teachers on standard eight pupils towards prevocational  
 496 subjects:Acomparative study of Nairobi and Tangaren division (Bungoma).

497 Onwuka, U. (1981). Curriculum development for Africa. *1* (1), 32-36.

498 Orodho, J., Waweru, P., & Ndichu, M. N. (2013). Basic Education in kenya.Focus on  
 499 strategies applied to cope with challenges inhibiting effective implementation of curriculum  
 500 international journal of Education Research. *1* (11), 1-20.

501 Orstein, L. A.-H., & Pajak.E. (2003). Contemporary issues in curriculum.

502 Owoyele, J., & O.M.Toyobo. (2008). Parental wills,peer pressure,academic ability and school  
 503 subject selection by students in senior secondary school.

- 504 P., K. (2012). *Factors influencing enrolment in agriculture course*. Highland: Laguna press.
- 505 Pedzisai, C., Chiwara, A., Dondo, B., Tsvere, M., & Munika, S. (2014). Addressing poor  
506 performance in the advanced level agriculture syllabus(9159) in the midlands  
507 province, zimbabwe. *journal of humanities and social science*, 19 (2).
- 508 Phillips, M. (1998). *Family background, parenting practices and the black-white test score*  
509 *gap*. Washington.
- 510 Raimi, S., & Adeoye, F. (2002). *Gender Differences among college students as determinant*  
511 *of performance in integrated science*. Nairobi: Longhorn.
- 512 Region, M. E. (Ed.). (2009, 5 27). *World bank*. Retrieved from  
513 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org>.
- 514 Republic of kenya. (2009). *Building a globally competitive economy*.
- 515 Republic of kenya. (2007). *The kenya vision 2030*. Nairobi: Government printer.
- 516 Riddeels, S., S. &. (2000). *Gender policy and education shifting agenda in the UK and*  
517 *Europe, London, Routledge*.
- 518 Saina, E., Kathuri, N., P.K, R., M.J, K., & Sulot., &. (2012). Food security in kenya: The  
519 impact of Building Rural Farmers' capacity through Agricultural Education in secondary  
520 school. *journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and policy studies*. 3 (3), 338-  
521 345.
- 522 Saiti, M.B. (1999). *Implementation of the 8-4-4 primary school music curriculum. A case*  
523 *study of Getembe and wanjare Divisions of Kisii District*. Unpublished MED thesis: Moi  
524 *University Eldoret, Kenya*.
- 525 Saylor, J. a. (1973). *Planning curriculum for schools*.
- 526 Schneider, M. (2002). Do school facilities affect academic outcomes? *National clearinghouse*  
527 *for educational facilities*.
- 528 Sheffied, J. J. (1976). *Agriculture in secondary schools case studies of Botswana, Kenya and*  
529 *Tanzania*.
- 530 Shiundu, J. O. (19192). *Curriculum theory and practice in Kenya*. Nairobi: Oxford  
531 *University Press*.
- 532 Sifuna, D. (1990). *Development of Education in Africa. The Kenyan Experience*.
- 533 Soboyejo, A. (2007). Academic discipline and gender difference in secondary school  
534 students' knowledge and practice on communicable diseases. *50th Annual Proceeding of*  
535 *Science Teachers*, 196-203.
- 536 Syeda, W.K. (2010). *Vocational and skills development: A case of Pakistan*.

- 537 Taba, H. (1962). Curriculum Development: Theory into practice.
- 538 Talbert, B., Vaughn, R. C., & Lee, J.S. (2007). *Foundations of agricultural education* (2nd  
539 Edition ed.). Danville, U.S.A: Professional educators.
- 540 Tayeb, A. B. E. (2003). *Experimental analysis of student course selection. British journal of*  
541 *education psychology*.
- 542 Thaw, R. (2010, Feb 3). Southjern cape school Rocked by Teacher-pupil sex problem.  
543 *Eyewitness News* , 4-6.
- 544 The World Bank. (2005). The economic advancement of women in Jordan. *A country gender*  
545 *assessment, social and economic development group middle east and north africa region* .
- 546 Toh, K. (1993). Gender and practical tasks. *Science Education Research* , 225-265.
- 547 UNESCO. (2005). *Education for All. THE QUALITY IMPERATIVE: EFA Global monitoring*  
548 *Report*. Paris: UNESCO.
- 549 UNESCO. (1999). World Education Report.
- 550 Wagfield, Battle, Keller, & Eccles, &. (2002). Sex differences in motivation, self  
551 concept, career aspirations and career choice.
- 552 Waithera, K. S. (2013, November). Challenges to teaching and learning of agriculture in  
553 secondary schools in Kakuyuni division Kangundo district Machakos county, Kenya.
- 554 Waliki L.M. & Usman, M. (2009). Achieving the millennium development goals. *Effective*  
555 *teaching of agricultural science of Nigeria*, 1 (1), 32-36.
- 556 Weinstein, C. (1979). The physical environment of the school I: *Review of Educational*  
557 *Research*, 49 (4), 577-610.
- 558 Wootoyitidde, J. (2010). The effect of funding on practical teaching of Agriculture in selected  
559 senior secondary schools in Rakai District, Uganda. *Unpublished*  
560 *Dissertation, Makerere University* .
- 561 Yong, P., C. L. (2011). *Factors that influence Branelan students not to enroll in secondary*  
562 *school Agriculture subject. Darassalam Brunei*.
- 563 Young, D. T. (1994). Gender differences in science achievement, Do schools effects make a  
564 difference? *Research in science teaching* , 857-871.
- 565
- 566
- 567
- 568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

UNDER PEER REVIEW