THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

School-Type as a Correlate to Secondary School Boys' and Girls' Self-Esteem in Nairobi County, Kenya

Shadrack Munanu Kithela
Lecturer, Department of Education,
Tharaka University College, Marimanti, Kenya

Abstract:
The study purposed to investigate how school-type was related to students' self-esteem by gender. The main question was, 'Does self-esteem of boys and girls significantly vary according to the school-type attended?'' Students' admission into different school-types is based on the criteria of their KCPE marks. National schools get the best KCPE grades, followed by Extra County schools, and at the bottom are Sub-County schools (Day schools) getting very low grades. Over time, ''school labels'' and prestige has developed among school categories. This may affect students' self-realization, consequently influencing their self-esteem. It is proposed that, a reciprocal influence exist between self-esteem and academic achievement. However, studies have not delved into finding out, if self-esteem of both boys and girls is influenced the same way across school types. This is with a view of addressing any psychological gap(s) that may influence one's academic performance. The study used correlational research design, guided by social cognitive and self-concept theories. A sample of 480 form 4 students from 12 public secondary schools in Nairobi County was used. Cluster and purposive sampling were used. 40 students from each school's stream were obtained through simple random sampling. Standardized questionnaires were administered to the 480 students to provide quantitative data. ANOVA tested differences in self-esteem for both boys and girls by school type. Null hypothesis was rejected at P< 0.05. The study found a significant difference in gender self-esteem by school type. Therefore, school type influences self-esteem for both males and females the same way. There was need to develop self-esteem enhancement programmes especially in day schools to boost academic performance. Moreover, expansion on day school's infrastructures was critical in improving on the school's environmental image for prestige and academic performance.

Keywords: *School-type, secondary school, boys, girls, self-esteem, self-realization*

1. Introduction

In Kenya today, the need for quality education is an issue of great concern to parents and educationists. Glaring academic performance gaps are experienced among schools of various categories or types. Self-esteem is one of the psychological constructs that have been found to relate to academic achievement.

Self-esteem has both psychological and sociological dimensions. Self-esteem has both psychological and sociological dimensions. Rosenberg (1965) defines self-esteem following a more socio-cultural approach. He states that, self-esteem is a favourable or unfavourable attitude that we have about ourselves, which is a result of the influences of the culture, society, family and interpersonal relationships. Similar to Rosenberg, Coppersmith (1967) defined self-esteem as an attitude and an expression of worthiness. He followed a behavioural standpoint and included success and self-worth as indicators of self-esteem. He stipulated that self-esteem is a construct or an acquired trait, meaning that an individual learns their worthiness originally from parents, which is later reinforced by other people.

During the school years, academic achievement is a significant contributor to self-esteem development. A student who consistently achieves success or one who consistently fails, will have his/her self-esteem being affected (Crocker, et al, 2002). Social comparisons play an important role in shaping a child's self-esteem and influence the positive or negative feelings they have about themselves. Adolescents peer influence is critical as they make appraisals of themselves with close friends (Thorne & Michaeliu, 1996). For instance, remark like 'I'm faster than you'', I passed better than you in the examinations'' play an important role in shaping adolescents' perceived competencies and global self-esteem (Altermatt et al, 2002, cited in Shaffer & Kipp, 2014)

Admissions of students in Kenyan secondary schools attract the highest marks in KCPE to National schools, followed by extra-county schools. The poor KCPE marks gain entry into Sub- County schools popularly called 'Day Schools'. National schools are perceived with a lot of prestige assigned to 'successful' students and at the bottom, the 'academically poor' students find themselves in the day schools. This 'poor' prestige perception is confounded by lack of adequate learning and teaching facilities and lack of underdeveloped infrastructure.

There are three main sources of self-esteem, that is: reflected appraisals, self- perceptions and social comparisons (Schwalbe, 1991). According to Shrauger and Schoeneman (1979, cited in Schwalbe, 1991), reflected appraisals are people's reactions to us; our interpretations of these reactions being most consequential. Self-perceptions are observations of our behaviour and its consequences. From these observations we make inferences about our abilities and

proclivities (Bem, 1972, in Schwalbe, 1991). According to Festinger (1954), Social comparisons involve using others as benchmarks for self-evaluation. We also learn about ourselves, by observation how we are similar to and different from others.

The entry of students to form one and school's categorization may influence their concepts of self-esteem. 'Conditions of worth' exhibited in the release of KCPE and KCSE performances enhances students' social comparisons, reflected appraisals and self-perceptions.

There are two levels of self-esteem, that is, high self-esteem and low self-esteem. If we have high self-esteem, we generally feel respect for and acceptance of ourselves. On the other hand, if we have low self-esteem, we generally lack respect for ourselves, reject part of who we are, and judge ourselves negatively. People with high self-esteem have a sense of *self-efficacy*- the expectation that they are capable of achieving their goals in many different kinds of situations (Feldman, 2004). On the other hand, individuals with low self-esteem are more insecure, and are weak in their ability to reach their goals. Their sense of purpose is not firm. Branden (2001) asserts that to have low self-esteem corresponds to not feeling ready for life, or to feeling wrong as a person. Low self-esteem can produce a cycle of failure hence leading to low expectations, reduced effort, elevated anxiety and poor performance (Feldman, 2004). The current study was thus interested in establishing whether students' psychological factors like self-esteem and career aspirations are related to school type and by extension, to academic performance in these schools.

Shaffer and Kipp (2014) cite Jean & Cheryl (2004) in their longitudinal study of adolescents from high-risk environments. The study found that youth with higher levels of self-esteem were less inclined to become depressed or display future conduct disorders. In another longitudinal study in New Zealand, found that adolescents with low self-esteem displayed poor mental and physical health, worse economic prospects, than did adolescents with high self-esteem (Trzesniewski et al, 2006, cited in Shaffer & Kipp, 2014). The self-esteem influence on economic prospects apparently points to its link with student's career aspirations.

Self-esteem is one of the most studied constructs in the modern social sciences. A large number of cross-sectional, longitudinal and cohort-sequential studies have given evidence that across cohorts, samples and measures; men tend to have higher self-esteem than women. Men and women also show age-related increases in self-esteem from late adolescence to middle adulthood (Orth & Robins, 2014, Donnellan & Robins, 2013 cited in Rentflow et al, 2015)

A person's cultural background represents a strong and pervasive set of environmental influences that may shape the expression, sources, and perhaps also the development of self-esteem (Bleidorn et al, 1999). A study was conducted to examine cross- cultural differences in gender effects in self-esteem. A sample of 985,937 men and women provided personality and demographic information over the World Wide Web. Data was collected between 1999 to 2009 as part of the Gosling-Potter Internet Personality Project (Gosling, Vasire, Srivastava, & John, 2004). The age of the participants ranged between 16-45 years. Large samples of participants were pooled within each country into five age groups (16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, and 36-45). Countries sample for culture diversity included Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Thailand, Turkey and U.S. A (Mean age =25 years, SD= 7.2; 60% females from 48 different nations)

Self-esteem was measured through self-report using the Single Self-esteem Scale (SISE); Robins et al, 2001). Participants rated the item 'I see myself as someone who has high self-esteem'' on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Disagree Strongly to 5(Agree Strongly). Strong evidence of reliability and validity was reported of SISE to be .75 (Robins et al, 2001). The current research was not cross-sectional nor did it cut across cultures, it used correlation research design. Self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg Self-esteem scale (RSES) with 10 questions on self-esteem measured at 4-point Likert scale. Only a small sample of 480 form 4 high school adolescent students from Nairobi County, Kenya participated in the study. Gender influence and self-esteem was not basically on cultural environmental factors but rather assumed to be the localized different school environments on self-esteem by gender. The differences in boys' self-esteem and differences in girls' self-esteem by school type was both studied.

Kristen, Shibley, Carolin, & Brenda (1999) conducted two meta- analytical studies on gender differences in self-esteem. The first analyses had 216 effect sizes, representing the testing of 97,121 respondents. The overall effect size was 0.21, a small difference favouring males. In the second analyses, gender differences were examined using 3 large, nationally representative data sets from the National Centre for Education Statistics (NCES). Approximately 48,000 young Americans were involved as respondents. The analyses indicated higher male self-esteem (DS ranged from 0.04 to 0.24). Both analyses provide evidence that males score higher on standard measures of global self-esteem than females, but the difference is small.

Gentile, Twenge, Grabe, Wells & Maitino (2009) conducted a Meta-Analysis on gender differences in domain specific self-esteem. Ten specific domains of self-esteem across 115 studies including 428 effect sizes and 32,428 individuals were involved. Men scored significantly higher than women on physical appearance (d = 0.35), personal self (d = 0.28), and self-satisfaction self-esteem (d = -0.38). There was no significant gender difference in academic, social acceptance, family and affect self-esteem. The results depict

Hossaini (2002) has contradicted other studies that have found a relationship between gender and self-esteem. Zeinvand (2006) cited by Naderi et al (2009) studied the relationship between self-esteem, social support and student's educational progression in high school in Dareh Shar, a city in Iran. 72 students (37 boys and 35 girls were randomly sampled. Coppersmith questionnaire of self-esteem was used. The t test revealed that self-esteem is more in boys than in girls. Naderi cites Zareh (1994) that there are significant differences in boys and girls' self-esteem. Zareh had also used Coppersmith self-esteem scale.

Naderi et al (2009) studied on self-esteem, gender and academic achievement of undergraduate students. The sample had 153 (105 males and 48 females) who completed the Persian version of RSES. Data was analysed by multi

nominal logistic regression and independent sample t-test. A significant gender difference was found between males and females. The current study sought to establish whether there are gender differences in students' self-esteem among public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. Those who completed the questionnaire were 451(262 boys and 189 girls) form four students. They used the ten item questions in the modified RSES to determine their level of self-esteem.

1.1. Research Problem

There has been a consistent academic performance gap among various school types in Nairobi County and Kenya at large. Nzomo (2012), did a study in Nairobi that revealed that all national public secondary schools had above average mean grades (B+). Most County schools had an average mean grade (C+) while majority of Sub- County schools had below average (D+) grades. Over time national schools have become prestigious and competitive against other school types. Most parents get concerned about the school type their children attend. This is because favourable school conditions may relate to positive outcomes such as high levels of self-esteem, good academic performance and realistic career aspirations. School type as a correlate to secondary school boys' and girls' self-esteem has not been adequately studied. The results of such a study may predict the academic performance gaps among school types and their gender.

1.2. Objectives

- To find out differences in students' self-esteem by school types.
- To investigate boys' and girls' differences in self-esteem by school type.

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The study employed an ex post facto correlational research design. In ex post facto research, the researcher does not have direct control of the independent variables because their manifestation has already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Orodho (2005) citing Kerlinger (1973) asserts that correlational research is useful in trying to make prediction about behavior. This design involves collecting data in order to determine whether and to what degree a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables. The degree of relationship is expressed in a correlational co-efficient (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). School type as a predictor variable is studied in relation to boys and girls' self-esteem. These variables are naturally occurring.

2.2. Research Sample

The research drew the accessible sample from 2014 students in form 4 classes from 12 public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The 12 schools were purposively sampled from the 12 clusters to include all the school types. A sample of 480 students was drawn from these 12 schools which was determined through simple random sampling of one class stream of 40 students. (N=12x40=480). The choice of the form 4 class was based on the assumption that form 4's had the most years of stay within the school tradition that would have led to greater internalized personality impact.

2.3. Research Instruments

Questionnaires for students' respondents were the main research instruments used to collect data. Questionnaires are commonly used instruments to collect important information about population. Questionnaire takes less time and less expensive. The questionnaires addressed specific objectives and/or hypothesis (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). A pilot study was done that included three secondary schools with a total of 65 students drawn from one national girls' school, one county boys' school and one sub- county coeducational school.

2.4. Data Analysis

Quantitative data was coded in variable view window of SPSS. Three null hypotheses were analyzed.

- $H_0$1-There is no significant relationship between school type and students' self-esteem.

This hypothesis was analyzed using chi-square statistics. Chi-square is a non-parametric test that is used in analysis to establish relationships between two variables that are categorical (nominal measurement) in nature. Self-esteem and school type variables are in nominal levels of measurement. School type was measured in four categories of Sub- County school-coded 1, County school-coded 2, Extra- County school-coded 3 and National school - coded 4. Self-esteem of students was measured using Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES) and was categorized as low, normal and high self-esteem.

- $H_0$2: There is no significant difference in boys' self-esteem by school type.
- $H_0$3: There is no significant difference in girls' self-esteem by school type.

One way ANOVA test analysis was done for both null hypotheses 3 and 4. Self-esteem means of boys and that of girls was compared separately among the four independent school types. The continuous self-esteem students' scores were used in the analysis. Scores range between 0-15 is considered low, 16-25 is normal and 26-30 is high self-esteem. School types were boys' national, boys' extra-county, boys' county and boys' sub-county, and similarly the same for girls' schools.

3. Research Findings

3.1. Relationship between School Type and Students' Self-esteem

The Participants School type was the Independent variable, measured at the nominal scale of four school categories, that is: national school (coded 4), Extra County (coded 3), county (coded 2) and sub-county school (coded 1). Self-esteem a dependent variable was measured using Rosenberg Self-esteem scale (RSES). The scale had ten items to measure self-esteem on a 4-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). The self-esteem scale ranges from 0 to 30.

Self-esteem Ranges	Freq	Percent
0 to 14(low)	142	31.5
15 to 25(normal)	147	32.6
26 to 30(high)	162	35.9
Total	451	100.0

Table 1: Self -esteem Score Ranges for the Student Participants

The Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES) scoring includes the following: Strongly Agree = 3, Agree = 2, Disagree = 1, Strongly Disagree = 0.

However, Items 2,5,6,8 and 9 are scored in the reverse, that is

SA = 0, A = 1, D = 2, SD = 3. Rosenberg (1965)

According to Table 1, about a third of the respondents (35.9%) scored within the range of 26 to 30 on self-esteem scale, which indicated high self-esteem. Those within the range of 15 to 25 were 32.6%, indicating normal range, while 31.5% scored a range of 0 to 14, which suggested low self-esteem.

Table 2 gives participants responses of frequency distribution of self-esteem ranges according to school-type

	Self-esteem			Total
School-type	0 to 14	15 to 25	26 to 30	
Day/District School	137	34	12	183
County	0	92	19	111
Extra County School	2	16	62	80
National School	3	5	69	77
Total	142	147	162	451

Table 2: Students' Summary Frequencies on Self-esteem Ranges versus School Types

According to the findings, 142 respondents had low self-esteem, 137(96.5%) came from sub-county schools. Two came from extra county schools and three from national schools. It is interesting to note that 137 out of 183 (74.9%) participants in the sub-county schools had low self-esteem, 18.6% had normal range self-esteem while only 6.6% had high self-esteem. National school participants, 69 out of 77 (89.6%) indicated high self-esteem. In the extra-county category, 62 out of 80 (77.5%) student participants expressed high self-esteem. The county school category had majority of their students with normal range level of self-esteem, that is, 92 respondents out of 111(82.8%). In this category, about 17.2% had high self-esteem. None had low self-esteem according to this research.

3.2. Relationship between Boys' Self-esteem by School Type

3.2.1. Hypothesis Testing

In relation to the objective, to find out if there were differences in boys' self-esteem by school type, a null hypothesis was formulated.

- $H_0$2: There are no significant differences in boys' self-esteem by school type.

One way ANOVA was done to test this null hypothesis

3.2.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

The self-esteem mean for male students in national schools was 26.32 (SD = 3.79, N = 262) followed closely by the male students in extra county with a mean of 26.20 (SD = 3.24, N = 262). A distant third was the male students in county schools who registered a self-esteem mean of 22.48 (SD = 4.08, N = 262). The male students in district secondary schools registered a mean of 12.88 (SD = 4.19, N = 262). This is illustrated in table 3.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Day/District School	134	12.88	4.19
County	50	22.48	4.08
Extra County School	40	26.20	3.24
National School	38	26.32	3.79
Total	262	18.69	7.27

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Self-esteem versus School type among Male Students

There is significant difference in the two Mean Squares (3235.46 and 15.84),
(f (3,258) = 204.24, p = 0.00). Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The self-esteem mean of male students in district, county, extra-county and national schools are not all equal. Table 4 gives the ANOVA results.

Self Esteem					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9706.39	3	3235.46	204.24	.000
Within Groups	4087.18	258	15.84		
Total	13793.57	261			

Table 4: ANOVA- Males Self-esteem by School Type

3.2.1.2. Post Hoc Testing
The table 5 'Multiple Comparisons' shows that five out of six pairs vary:
District versus County school _ Sig. < 0. 001.These groups vary.
District versus Extra-County school _ Sig. < 0.001. These groups vary.
District versus National school _ Sig. < 0.001. These groups vary.
County versus Extra-County _ Sig. < 0. 001.These groups vary.
County versus National _ Sig. < 0.001. These groups do not vary.
Extra-County versus *National* _ Sig. = 0.898. These groups do not vary

Multiple Comparisons: LSD				
(I) School type	(J) School type	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Day/District School	County	-9.59940*	0.66	.000
	Extra County School	-13.31940*	0.72	.000
	National School	-13.43519*	0.73	.000
County	Day/District School	9.59940*	0.66	.000
	Extra County School	-3.72000*	0.84	.000
	National School	-3.83579*	0.86	.000
Extra County School	Day/District School	13.31940*	0.72	.000
	County	3.72000*	0.84	.000
	National School	-.11579	0.90	.898
National School	Day/District School	13.43519*	0.73	.000
	County	3.83579*	0.86	.000
	Extra County School	.11579	0.90	.898

Table 5: Multiple Comparisons: Male Self-Esteem Versus School Type

3.3. Relationship between Girls' Self-esteem by School Type

3.3.1. Hypothesis Testing

In relation to the objective, to find out if there were differences in girls' self-esteem by school type, a null hypothesis was formulated.

- $H_0$3: There are no significant differences in girls' self-esteem by school type. One way ANOVA was done to test this null hypothesis.

3.3.2. Descriptive Statistics

The self-esteem mean for female students in national schools was 26.62 (SD = 3.51, N = 189) followed closely by the female students in extra-county with a mean of 24.88 (SD = 4.83, N = 189). A distance third was the female students in county schools who registered a self-esteem mean of 20.43 (SD = 2.87, N = 189). The female students in district secondary schools registered a mean of 17.06 (SD = 6.71, N = 189).
This is illustrated in table 6.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Day/District School	49	17.06	6.71
County	61	20.43	2.87
Extra County School	40	24.88	4.83
National School	39	26.62	3.51
Total	189	21.77	5.89

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Self Esteem versus School Type among Female Students

3.3.3. ANOVA

There is a significant difference between the two Mean Squares (832.63 and 21.8), (f (3,185) = 38.19, p = 0.00). This means that the null hypothesis was rejected. The self-esteem means of female students in district, county, extra county and national schools are not all equal.

Self Esteem					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2497.88	3	832.63	38.19	.000
Within Groups	4033.34	185	21.80		
Total	6531.22	188			

Table 7: ANOVA-Females Self-esteem by School Type

3.3.4. Post Hoc Testing

The Table 8 'Multiple Comparisons' between female self-esteem by school type shows that five out of six pairs vary:

(I) School Type	(J) School Type	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Day/District School	County	-3.36501*	1.03	.009
	Extra County School	-7.81378*	1.23	.000
	National School	-9.55416*	1.11	.000
County	Day/District School	3.36501*	1.03	.009
	Extra County School	-4.44877*	0.85	.000
	National School	-6.18916*	0.67	.000
Extra County School	Day/District School	7.81378*	1.23	.000
	County	4.44877*	0.85	.000
	National School	-1.74038	0.95	.265
National School	Day/District School	9.55416*	1.11	.000
	County	6.18916*	0.67	.000
	Extra County School	1.74038	0.95	.265

Table 8: Multiple Comparisons: Games-Howell: Female Self-Esteem by School Type

4. Discussions of the Results

Self-esteem is an individual's subjective evaluation of his or her worth as a person (Orth & Robins, 2014 p.381). Girls exhibited higher self-esteem than boys. There is a shift from most researches that report males having higher self-esteem than females. In Kenya there has been a lot of attention on the girl child welfare including education. The boy child/gender seems to be neglected. Could this influence self-esteem? Again, the study was done in an urban set-up, where there could have been a lot of female emancipation backgrounds than would be in the rural set ups where cultures or traditions may exhibit conservative tendencies.

Self-esteem of both boys and girls follow similar trends across school types. Boys and Girls in national schools experience higher standards of global self-esteem and this cascade down to low self-esteem among boys and girls in sub-county/day schools. Differences among these school types in factors like school environments, academic achievements, self-efficacy and career aspirations may come into play to influence self-esteem linking to theoretical perspective by Rogers (1959) and Bandura (1986, 1997)

A large number of cross-sectional, longitudinal and cohort-sequential studies report that men tend to have higher self-esteem than women (Orth & Robin, 2014, Donnellan & Robins, 2013 cited in Rentflow et al, 2015). These findings contradict the current study results that reported more girls have high self-esteem than boys across the four school types. The cross- cultural gender differences in self-esteem were done among 985,937 participants in different countries and cultures. The current correlation study was only confined to 480 form 4 students in the county of Nairobi, Kenya. The cross-cultural study was done in a span of 10 years (1999-2009) with respondents' age range between 16-45years. Also, self-esteem was measured through self-esteem report using the Single Self-esteem Scale (SISE); (Robins et al, 2001). The current study used the RSES (Rosenberg, 1965) 10 items. A Meta-analysis done by Kristen, Shibley, Carolin & Brenda (1999) on gender differences in self-esteem also found that males score higher on standard measures of global self-esteem than females, but the difference is small.

A study by Hossaini (2002) on forecasting between self-esteem, parenting and gender among pre-university students in Shiraz found out that gender is not a predictor of self-esteem of pre-university students. He used coppersmith self-esteem test in data collection on a sample of 240 students. The results contrasted with the current study findings that there is gender difference in self-esteem. Girls seemed to exhibit higher self-esteem than boys did. Some differences between the two studies are noted in that, the current study used Rosenberg self-esteem scale in data collection to a sample of 480 public secondary school students from various school types whereas the study by Hossaini used Coppersmith Self-esteem test in data collection on a sample of 240 students. The location of the studies was in two different continents and countries, one in Africa and the other in Asian continent.

5. Conclusion

The findings revealed that majority of the students from national and extra county schools had high self-esteem at 89.6 percent and 77.5 percent respectively. This compared to only 6.6 percent of students from sub-county schools who suggested having high self-esteem. A high majority (74.86 percent) of students in sub-county schools had low self-esteem. Across all school types about one third of the students (31.5 percent) had low self-esteem and 35.6 percent had high self-esteem. The remaining 32.6 percent fell under normal range.

One way ANOVA was also computed to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the means of self-esteem for males among the four school types. The descriptive statistics for males mean in national schools was 26.32 (SD=3.79, N = 262), closely followed by extra county schools with M=26.20 (SD=3.24, N= 262). Males in county schools, M=22.48 (SD= 4.08, N= 262) and at the bottom, males from the sub-county schools with mean= 12.88 (SD=4.19, N= 262). The one-way ANOVA inferential statistics showed that there was a big difference in the two mean squares (3235.46 and 15.84) leading to a significant difference, f (3,258) = 204.24, p = 0.00

For females across school types, the same trend was followed just like males. National schools M=26.62 (SD=3.51, N= 189), extra county schools M=24 (SD= 4.83, N=189), County schools M= (20.43 (SD= 2.87, N = 189) and sub-county schools M=17.06 (SD= 6.71, N= 189). ANOVA statistics found much difference between two means (832.63 and 21.8): f (3,185) = 38.19, p = 0.00. The patterns for both males and females' gender in terms of self-esteem does not change when both are in the same category of school. Boys and girls in national schools exhibited similar high self-esteem compared to those who were in sub-county schools who generally recorded low self –esteem.

6. Recommendations

Most of the students with low self-esteem (31% of secondary students) come from sub-county schools. It is imperative to develop a school curriculum programme to handle self-esteem enhancement. Form one students should be introduced to the knowledge on psychological self-concept variables that may influence their educational and career outcomes. Students who enter especially into sub-county secondary schools may exhibit negative experiences and energy because of their low socio-economic backgrounds and can easily conform to irrational, maladaptive view of pessimism. Self-esteem enhancement programmes may help such students to undergo some form of positive cognitive restructuring. This may undoubtedly translate to improved academic performance in sub-county school students.

Schools need to regularly engage psychological experts to motivate students.

The students' poor outlook of their schools (mostly sub-county schools) will improve when the government and community invest heavily on learning resources like enough quality classrooms, laboratories, textbooks and enough teachers.

7. References

i. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action:A Social Cognitive Theory.* Englewood cliffs: NJ:Prentice Hall.
ii. Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of Cognitive Process through Perceived self-efficacy*. Developmental Psychology,* 25, 729-735
iii. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficancy:The Exercise of Control.* New York: Freeman.
iv. Branden, N. (2001). *Psychology of Self-Esteem* . New York: Nash Publishing Corporation.
v. Cloninger, S. C. (2007). *Theories of Personality:Understanding Persons,(4th Ed).* . Upper Saddle River,New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
vi. Crocker, J., Sommers, S. R., & Luhtanen, R. K. (2002). Hopes Dashed and Dreams Fulfilled. Contigencies of Self-Worth and Graduate School Admissions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1275-1286.
vii. Feldman, R. S. (2004). *Power Learning: Strategies for Success in College and Life.* New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
viii. Hossaini, T. A. (2002). Forecasting Between Self-Esteem, Parenting and Gender Among Pre-University Students in Shiraz*. American Journal of Scientific Research*, 221-229.
ix. Kristen, K.C., Shibley, H., Carolin, S.J., & Brenda, B.N. (1999). Gender
x. Differences in Self-esteem: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin,
xi. vol.4, 25(4), 470-500. Psychnet.apa.org
xii. Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: ACTS.
xiii. Naderi, H., Abdullah, R., Aizan, H. T., Sharir, J., & Kumar, V. (2009). Self-Esteem, Gender and Academic Achievement of Undergraduate Students. *American Journal of Scientic Research*, 26-37.

xiv. Nzomo, L. M. (2012). Relationship between principals Emotional Intelligence and students' learning achievements in public secondary schools in
xv. Nairobi County, Kenya. Ph.D. Thesis. Kenyatta University.ir-library.ku.ac.ke
xvi. Orodho, J. A. (2004). *Techniques of Writing Research: Proposal and Reports in Education and Social Sciences.* Nairobi: Masola Publisher.
xvii. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
xviii. Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self.* New York: Basic Books.
xix. Shaffer, D.R., & Kipp K. (2014). *Developmental psychology. Childhood and Adolescence (9th Ed)*. USA Wadsworth Cengage Learning