

Perceptions of instructional resource access and use under the West Kenya Sugar Company scholarship programme in Kakamega North Sub-County, Kenya

Beatrice Imbuka Jadevela¹

Eric Wekesa Wangila²

Aggrey Mukasa Simiyu³

¹beatriceimbuka15@gmail.com [+254706377521]

¹<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1964-9643>

^{1,2,3} Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

<https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.7.4.85>

ABSTRACT

Corporate scholarship schemes are primarily conceived as a way of lowering the financial obstacles that learners may face, but they can also be seen to shape the context of teaching and learning. These claims need to be separated from the availability of a resource, access to that resource, use of that resource for instruction, and support of learners' well-being. This study was on teachers' and sponsored students' perceptions of the influence of the West Kenya Sugar Company Limited (WEKSCOL) corporate scholarship programme on the access and use of instructional resources in two secondary schools in Kakamega North Sub-county in Kenya. It was guided by the Education Production Function (EPF) that treats education like a production process where adequate resources and a conducive learning environment, will likely lead to student academic achievement. A descriptive cross-sectional survey design using both quantitative and qualitative methods was adopted. The study utilised a census of 48 teachers, 60 sponsored students, and two school administrators. 42 teachers, 60 students, and both administrators provided usable responses. The data sources were teacher questionnaires, student questionnaires, an administrator interview guide, an observation checklist, and a document analysis guide. The collected data for the questionnaires were interpreted and analysed in terms of frequency, percentages, and arithmetic average; documentary evidence was used to qualify programmes. Despite being marketed as a service for learners rather than a learning resource, Results for Boarding support received the most positive ratings, with teacher Mean 3.301 and learner Mean 3.741. The overall mean of teachers and students for instructional-resource access, excluding boarding, was 2.535 and 2.930, respectively. The means of the teachers (2.304) and students (3.425) had the greatest discrepancy on library resources, and the means of teachers (3.013) and students (2.268) had the greatest discrepancy on laboratory equipment. Teachers' and students' overall means for resource-supported instructional practices were 2.783 and 3.184, respectively. The results revealed that there was both selective and mixed perceived influence; students tended to have more positive experiences than teachers. The study recommended that programme monitoring should differentiate the support to learner fees and boarding from the investment of school resources and that it should examine the quality of resources, their condition, access, and actual use of resources, based on verifiable records.

Keywords: Corporate Scholarship, Instructional Resources, Kenya Resource Access, Resource Use, Secondary Education,

I. INTRODUCTION

Education financing can impact both the access learners have to education and the conditions for education and learning. Scholarships are typically intended to lower the direct expenses of attending school for students and their families, such as tuition, on-campus accommodation, learning materials, and other allowable school fees. Gordon and Rose (2018) stated that targeted scholarships can help keep a child from dropping out of school if the aid is “largement visible, inclusif et suffisamment grand pour combler les lacunes et faire face aux obstacles auxquels les foyers sont confrontés”. In this context, corporate scholarships can help in facilitating access to education by minimising the interruptions due to fee delinquency and financial difficulties of the household.

A learner scholarship, on the other hand, is not an institutional development grant. Usually, a scholarship is for an individual beneficiary or for approved costs for learners, while a grant for an institution funds items such as facilities, equipment, teaching and learning materials, staff or organised school services. In public secondary schools, this distinction is necessary and important as the various forms of government capitation, contribution, support, and income from the community and from other partners may coexist. Zubairi and Rose (2019) saw the need to focus on secondary education financing, not just on the quantum of financing but also on who receives the funding and which costs are borne by the household. This means that the resources for a programme at school may not necessarily be counted as a scholarship even though the programme is given in the same school.

Instructional resources include physical plant, materials, equipment, and people who are directly involved in instruction and learning. These encompass class, books, classroom and laboratory equipment, computers, desks,

teachers, librarians and lab assistants. Barrett et al., (2019) found that educational infrastructure can be influential with regard to safety, comfort, organisation and pedagogical opportunity, while educational value is dependent on suitability, maintenance, functionality and use. However, a facility could be there with no reliability, unimproved and not become pedagogically useful.

The difference between availability, access and use is crucial in particular. Availability refers to whether a resource is available, whereas access refers to whether teachers and learners can access and use it at the time that they need it. Use refers to its use in the lessons, practical work, assessment, guided study, and independent study. Mwaniki et al. (2022) discovered that Effective Utilisation of educationally meaningful provision is the most important factor in determining the value of any educational resource that is provided. A library, for instance, may be available but with minor hours of operation or may have fewer books; a laboratory may have the required equipment, but consumables, power, safety measures, or access may be a problem.

The level of resource-supported instructional practices provides another connection between school inputs and learning. Though the practices such as syllabus coverage, practical lessons, internal examinations, supervised study, participation in science activities, and learner self-study may be supported by resources, each practice is also impacted by a range of factors, including staffing, timetabling, teacher competence, learner attendance, school leadership, and institutional routines. However, Hanushek (2020) interpreted the educational outcomes not as a function of one resource only, but as a function of a combination of resources and processes. This view is critical of using students' positive perceptions of a scholarship programme as evidence of the direct impact of a programme on instructional changes.

In Kenya, financing for secondary education is a complex mix of government capitation, household contribution, bursaries and scholarships, and also receives funding from corporate and nongovernmental sources. The Ministry of Education (2023) emphasises a number of ongoing priorities for the national education sector, including equity, curriculum implementation, teacher development and learning conditions. Nevertheless, Ogawa (2022) showed that school resource and community capacity expansions can coexist with school inequalities. Olang' et al. (2021) also noted that ensuring access did not necessarily result in improved mean examination performance of rural public day schools during Free Day Secondary Education.

West Kenya Sugar Company Limited (WEKSCOL) launched the WEKSCOL Scholarship Scheme for bright and needy learners in the sugarcane-growing region of Kenya. The programme was offered in two secondary schools during the data collection period and had a viable population of 60 sponsored learners. This programme memorandum of understanding (MOU) delineated eligibility requirements, the support of fees, how the funds would be cost shared, conduct of the programme, continued performance conditions, and the sponsor's right to withdraw (Ali, 2018). It did not, on its own, give the full picture with regards to financing individual assets as part of a programme, and did not include details of every classroom, every library and/or laboratory, every desk, every piece of equipment and every staff position covered by the programme having been financed directly from WEKSCOL.

The present study thus concentrated on the perceptions of teachers as well as of sponsored students regarding access to and utilisation of the instructional materials in both beneficiary schools. Boarding was kept as a learner support service and was reported separately to instructional resources. It has also maintained teacher and student voice in its development as teacher-student relationships are unique and the responses of these stakeholders are distinct when engaging with resources. Teachers can assess its adequacy, condition, relevance in the curriculum, and whether it is technically feasible, while students can assess whether they would personally have access to a desk, book, laboratory item, study space, and/or hands-on activity.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The WEKSCOL Scholarship Scheme was established to support academically gifted learners experiencing financial hardship in the sugarcane-growing region of Kenya. The programme documentation identified fee support and associated costs, but these provisions did not necessarily establish that the scholarship covered school infrastructure, learning materials, boarding services, staffing and instructional practices. Distinguishing direct learner support from broader institutional resources is important because the availability of educational facilities and services does not automatically establish that individual learners benefit from them (UNESCO, 2024; World Bank, 2018).

Furthermore, the presence of educational resources in a school does not necessarily mean that they are adequate, accessible, functional or effectively utilised. The World Bank (2018) explains that school infrastructure and other educational inputs contribute to learning when they support effective teaching and learning processes. Similarly, the availability of textbooks and other instructional materials does not guarantee their effective use in classroom instruction (UNESCO, 2024). Consequently, evaluating educational support requires consideration of resource availability, adequacy, accessibility, condition and utilisation rather than relying solely on whether resources are reported to exist.

Teachers and sponsored students may also offer different perspectives on the adequacy and usefulness of educational resources because they experience the learning environment from different positions. Teachers may assess resources in relation to curriculum delivery and instructional requirements, whereas students may evaluate them in terms

of their accessibility and contribution to their learning experiences. Examining these perspectives separately can therefore provide a more comprehensive understanding of perceived resource adequacy and utilisation.

Against this background, the present study addresses a context-specific evidence gap concerning teachers' and sponsored students' perceptions of educational resources and learner support services in the two secondary schools benefiting from the WEKSCOL Scholarship Scheme. It distinguishes instructional resources from learner support services and examines resource availability, accessibility and utilisation as separate dimensions. It also recognises the limitation of the available programme documentation in establishing, at the individual-asset level, which reported resources were financed directly by WEKSCOL. The study therefore interprets respondents' assessments as perceived influences of the scholarship programme, rather than as conclusive evidence of causal programme effects.

1.2 Research Objective

The objective of the study was to examine teachers' and students' perceptions of the influence of the WEKSCOL scholarship programme on access to and use of instructional resources in the beneficiary secondary schools.

1.3 Research Question

How did teachers and students perceive the influence of the WEKSCOL scholarship programme on access to and use of instructional resources in the beneficiary secondary schools?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

The study was guided by the Education Production Function (EPF) that explains educational outcomes as products of multiple inputs and processes, including learner and family characteristics, teacher quality, school resources, peers, and the organisation of instruction. Hanushek (2020) emphasised that the way resources are used may be as important as the quantity of resources provided. Applied to this study, the WEKSCOL scholarship programme represented the focal programme input, instructional resource availability represented a school input, access and use represented an instructional process. The framework also clarifies why academic outcomes cannot be solely attributed to the scholarship programme. Prior learner achievement, teacher competence, class size, school leadership, household socioeconomic conditions, school culture, and other funding sources could influence academic performance.

2.2 Empirical Review

Resource conditions have been found to be associated with educational quality in Kenya on numerous occasions, and there are clear inequalities in the provision. Mwaniki et al., (2022) indicated that the level of instructional resources, facilities, and staffing in public Secondary schools in Murang'a County was related to the indicators of educational quality. It was important that provision should be explored alongside classroom utilization implying that there should be monitoring of which library books are borrowed, which laboratories are scheduled, which equipment is in working order, and which teachers use all the resources and equipment available to them in instruction, not just whether they are physically installed. This finding agreed with that of Ndemo and Kwaba (2023) that identified physical infrastructure, human resources, and teaching-learning resources as factors that influence academic performance in public secondary schools of Nyamira County. Their descriptive design, however, could not distinguish among the various causal mechanisms. The evidence suggests that resource conditions should be examined along with extra care taken in attributing outcomes to one programme. These resonate with the current study in the WEKSCOL setting, that sought to determine whether access and use was perceived as having improved or not.

Results from the study conducted by Nkosheshe (2024) in Kajiado county demonstrated that multiple types of support can exist within an external support programme. It revealed that non-governmental support given in the form of teaching and learning materials, scholarships and infrastructure facilitated access and retention of learners. It also highlighted the importance of establishing whether the contributions came from the scholarship in particular. The findings align with the objective of the current WEKSCOL study. In a separate study, Macharia et al., (2023) found that the classroom physical environment was relevant to teachers' appraisal of students' KCSE performance in Laikipia County. This evidence suggested that attention should be paid to classroom conditions, but did not prove that any one particular sponsor was responsible for those conditions in the schools. The study further observed that it takes more than buildings for a science laboratory and a computer laboratory to deliver instruction.. Effective use depends on apparatus, chemicals, safety provisions, maintenance, electricity, connectivity, relevant software, teacher competence, and scheduled access. Although libraries aid reading, reference, independent study and access to material outside the classroom, effective use is influenced by the size of the collection, relevance of the collection, seating, hours of operation, borrowing arrangements, supervision, and the degree to which teachers involve students in assignments concerned with the library. According to Haleem et al., (2022), the realisation of benefits requires infrastructure, teacher readiness, appropriate content, and integration into pedagogy.

Barrett et al. (2019) compiled evidence that infrastructure can shape learning by bringing safety, comfort, organisation and pedagogic support, and that this includes the school's setting. The report did not recommend that the achievement be judged solely from the building's aspect. Instead, the educational benefits of infrastructure hinge on design, maintenance, suitability, and integration in education and learning processes. The classroom is a basic physical resource because it protects learners and materials, influences the organization of lessons, and it affects the size of class and interaction. A Corporate scholarship like the WEKSCOL input can directly or indirectly impact school resources. Direct influence is where the sponsor is the owner of its own funding, procurement, supply or employment of the resource. Indirect influence can be where predictable fee payments also result in fewer arrears, better school cash flow, and/or release household and school resources for other priorities. Evidence was needed and the influence not be assumed simply because the programme and the resource were co-located at the same time.

No previous study had specifically addressed teachers' and sponsored students' perceptions in the two WEKSCOL beneficiary schools, separating learner support services from instructional resources and separately reporting access from instructional use. This study provided descriptive evidence and qualified the respondents' perceptions of the formal scope of the programme and the documentary evidence available.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study was a quantitative and qualitative descriptive cross-sectional survey (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Teachers, sponsored students and school administrators were interviewed in the two beneficiary schools at one point in 2026. The questionnaire was used to obtain numerical ratings and administrator interviews, observation and document review were designed to provide contextual and verification information. The design was considered appropriate to illustrate existing perceptions and to compare the pattern reported by teachers and students.

3.2 Study Area

The study was conducted in Kakamega North Sub-County, Kakamega County, Kenya. The area was chosen because WEKSCOL is located in the sub-county and the scholarships were available in two secondary schools at the time data was collected. The schools were coded as School A and School B to minimise unnecessary identification of respondents and the perception of the school levels.

3.3 Target Population and Census

The total sample of accessible population consisted of 48 teachers, 60 sponsored students and 2 school administrators for a total number of 110 eligible participants. Teachers were involved because they were those responsible for the implementation of the curriculum and use of teaching and learning materials, whilst the information of the sponsored students covered their own access and learning experiences. Administrators were included due to the handling of school records and resources, and their role in the institutional relationship with the WEKSCOL programme. Due to a small population size, the study chose to census all eligible participants instead of sampling.

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

Data were collected using a teacher questionnaire, a student questionnaire, an administrator interview guide, an observation checklist, and a document analysis guide. The teacher questionnaire covered the availability of resources such as desks, library resources, laboratory equipment and the school demonstration plot, as well as teaching with the support of resources. A student survey was used to assess the students' own personal access to the same resources and learning practices that go with them. Boarding was clearly labelled as a learner support service rather than an instructional resource.

The administrator interview guide focused on the formal range of the programme, fee support, resource contributions separately documented but in relation to the programme, access/use, staffing, other funding sources and programme limits of attribution. The observation checklist focused on the presence, apparent condition, access, and visibility of use of select resources. The document analysis guide included the programme memorandum of understanding, lists of beneficiaries, records of fees held, school inventories, records of procurements or donations, staff records, Times Tables and Library/Laboratory use records. The questionnaire items were rated on a 5-point scale range of 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree). The midpoint of 3.00 was simply used as a descriptive reference. A mean higher than the midpoint meant that there was a tendency to agree, a mean lower than the midpoint meant that there was a tendency to disagree.

3.5 Pilot Study, Validity, and Reliability

To check for clarity, wording, sequence, completion time, and coverage of study variables, the instruments were piloted in one participating school with sponsored students and relevant teachers. The instruments, objective, and

operational definition were checked during the Supervisors' and reviewers' analysis of content validity, and the pilot participants' responses were analysed as a contribution to face validity. No unsupported reliability coefficient was reported because the item-level pilot data and output of the Cronbach's alpha was not available for verification. This restriction was taken into account when interpreting results.

3.6 Data Collection and Analysis

Questionnaires were used in the agreed school context and administrator interviews took place in private settings; observations and a document review was undertaken where access was allowed. Quantitative data were coded and analysed using SPSS 26. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe patterns of response, and arithmetic means were used in summarising the five-point items. Qualitative and documentary information provided clarity on the formal scope of the programme and excluded the reality of a resource allocated to a school for the benefit of which the allocation pathway was not clear from the available records and thus classified as not counted as a WEKSCOL resource. Independent thematic reanalysis of complete (transcribed) interview texts and observation records was not possible, which meant that the article does not involve new quotations or unsubstantiated qualitative claims.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Before data was collected, consent was granted by the institutional authorisation, research licence, and permission of the relevant education authorities and participating schools. A beneficiary list in the form of a staff register and school administrative records was used to identify the eligible teachers, sponsored students and administrators. The study received the necessary institutional permission and research licence. The consent requirements for adults and permissions/assent for students were complied with. The procedure for participation was voluntary, and the respondents were told that they could refuse to answer any item or that they could refuse to participate without penalty. Coded questionnaires, private interviews, and secure handling of data and aggregate reporting all ensured confidentiality. The two institutions are referred in the findings as School A and School B.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Response Rate

The census targeted forty-eight (48) teachers, sixty (60) sponsored students, and two (2) administrators. Forty-two (42) teachers returned usable questionnaires, all sixty (60) sponsored students participated, and both administrators completed the relevant study procedures. The resulting response rates were 87.5% for teachers, 100.0% for students, and 100.0% for administrators, giving an overall response rate of 94.5% (Table 1). The teacher response rate was sufficient to describe the views returned from the two schools, although the six teachers who did not participate may have held different perceptions. The analysis did not replace missing teacher responses or assume that non-respondents shared the views of participants.

Table 1

Participant Response rate

Category	No. of Respondents	%
Teachers (n=48)	42	87.5
Sponsored students (n=60)	60	100.0
Administrators (n=2)	2	100.0
Total (n=110)	104	94.5

4.1.1 Perceived Influence on Access to and Use of Instructional Resources

Teachers and students gave their perceptions of the influence of WEKSCOL scholarship on access to and use of library resources, students' desks, school farm/demonstration plot, and laboratory equipment (Table 1). Boarding was reported separately as a learner support service. The respondents also gave their perceptions of how access to and use of the instructional resources had enabled the overall instruction process (Table 2 & Table 3).

Table 2*Perceived Influence of WEKSCOL Scholarship on Access to and Use of Instructional Resources*

Indicator	Teacher mean	Student mean
Library resources	2.304	3.425
Students' desks	3.013	3.313
School farm/demonstration plot	1.809	2.716
Laboratory equipment	3.013	2.268
Boarding (support service)	3.301	3.741
Instructional-resource mean, excluding boarding	2.535	2.930

Note. Teacher $n = 42$ and student $n = 60$. Boarding was excluded from the instructional-resource mean because it is a learner support service. The midpoint was 3.00; no inferential test was conducted.

There was no strong aggregate evidence to suggest that the WEKSCOL scholarship programme had enhanced access to and use of all learning resources (Table 2). Instead, selective perceived influence showed more positive ratings from students towards access to the library and desks while teachers had positive ratings for the library and laboratory resources. Weak ratings were received for the demonstration plot and laboratory equipment. Boarding services received the highest means (> 3.00) at 3.301 and 3.741 among teachers and students respectively. Both groups, therefore, tended to associate the WEKSCOL programme with improved boarding support. The stronger student rating was consistent with learners' direct experience of accommodation, daily routines, and study time. However, the item was not included in the instructional resource mean because boarding supports welfare and participation rather than functioning as a classroom material or teaching facility. This conceptual separation prevented a favourable learner-support rating from inflating the assessment of instructional-resource access. The lowest mean of 1.809 was obtained from teacher perceptions on the scholarship effect on access and use of the school farm or demonstration plot, student perception though at 2.716, was also lower than the midpoint of 3.00. Both respondents thus showed little inclination to explain that the programme had improved access to this resource. The low ratings may suggest any or all of the following: limited presence, poor development, restricted access, or weak association with the WEKSCOL scholarship.

The differences between the teacher and student perceptions indicated that it would be appropriate to analyse the groups separately. Resources were normally assessed as they appeared to teachers as the input to their curriculum, and for the student as the opportunity in which they could use them. These findings agree with those of Mwaniki et al. (2022) and Ndemo and Kwaba (2023) showing that resource availability does not guarantee access or utilisation further emphasizing the importance of actual use. The findings also agree with those of Haleem et al., (2022) who showed that technology produces educational value only when supporting conditions and teacher capacity are present. However, the findings of the current WEKSCOL study similarly indicate mixed perceptions across indicators. Mwaniki et al., (2022) suggest that there must be a relation between resource provision and utilisation; their study argues that the utilisation itself can be experienced differently by those who are managing the instruction (teachers) and those who are being instructed (students). The result of perceptions on boarding services was more directly compatible with the programme memorandum of understanding (MOU) that included items such as fees support and cost sharing arrangements, which may have reasonably incorporated approved boarding arrangements for sponsored learners. This was corroborated by interview findings with school administrators which revealed that the scholarship had enabled construction of two hostels with bed capacity for 200 learners in one of the supported schools.

4.1.2 Perceived Resource-Supported Instructional Practices

From Table 3, student perceptions were positive (Mean > 3.00) across all indicators of resource support to the instruction process through early completion of the syllabus, more internal examinations and testing, meaningful engagement in self-study, more practical lessons, participation in science congress/innovation activities, and teacher supervision of students' study programmes. This observation was attributed to the direct relevance of the programme to the sponsored students, who received accommodation at school. The teachers, on the other hand, might have applied a stricter institutional standard and determined if practices were deployed school-wide or funded directly by the sponsor. The mixed responses were consistent with those of Hanushek (2020) and who suggested that though educational inputs can impact outcomes through instruction and other organisational processes, simply having a facility and/or a scholarship, in and of themselves, does not constitute a positive rating of an instructional practice.

Table 3*Perceived Resource-Support to Instruction*

Instructional practice enabled	Teacher mean	Student mean
Early completion of the syllabus	3.117	3.630
More internal examinations and testing	2.171	3.175
Meaningful engagement in self-study	3.030	3.130
More practical lessons	3.030	3.117
Participation in science congress/innovation activities	2.735	3.035
Supervision of students' study programmes	2.618	3.018
Overall mean	2.783	3.184

Note. Teacher $n = 42$ and student $n = 60$. The means describe respondent perceptions only. No inferential test was conducted.

4.2 Integrated Discussion

The perceived influence of the programme was partial for both sets of findings. Boarding provision and students' access to the library were relatively positive, but the demonstration plot and access to laboratory equipment were weaker. Students also perceived teaching practices more favorably than the teachers. These trends highlight that a programme may be highly regarded by beneficiaries and still lead to a mixed bag of school-wide ratings.

The Results further support the conceptual difference between learner support and instructional resources. Boarding may be included in one measure of instructional resources, but cannot be combined with desks, books, equipment or a demonstration plot, and the value of boarding as an enhancement needs to be measured separately and added to the other units of measure. The analysis based on boarding alone resulted in a more valid overall judgment because, in both groups, the resource-access means was lower than the overall mean.

The results also showed that access is not equivalent to availability and that use is not equivalent to access. A teacher could report that the equipment was good for demonstrations, but maybe not as good with regard to access for students in practical work. A student can find the library's content to be valuable to the student, while a teacher can find the collection to be too limited in scope for the curriculum. This is not simply a difference; it identifies a point in the resource pathway that needs to be monitored. According to the research findings (Ozcan, 2021) a school's physical conditions effects students' academic success in terms of learning, motivation and creativity; school management effects students' academic success in terms of operation and attitude. School environment affects students' academic success in terms of motivation, social effects and socio-economic effects. Teachers affect students' academic success in terms professional competence, being role modes in communication, attitude, motivation and guidance.

Kapur (2018) cites teacher quality and skills and resource provision as school level factors that shape secondary student achievement in India. Mwaniki et al. (2022) related the quality of education to the provision and utilisation of instructional materials. Resources were also linked to academic results by Ndemo and Kwaba (2023), but they warned against being cautious in assigning causal explanations to the results of a descriptive design. Results of the present study on WESCOL expand the stage of the stakeholders by showing the need to consider use from the perspective of the implementers of curricula as well as the learners.

The existence of fee support, eligibility, conditions of performance, cost sharing, and a governance arrangement was supported by the formal programme documents. They did not agree to complete the institutional package that included classrooms, libraries, laboratories, equipment, demonstration plots, or job positions. Widened influence perceptions may include indirect effects, such as better cash flow for the school and paying for sponsored learners' school fees or other support outside of the terms of reference that the memorandum covers. Those pathways are only speculative and need to be backed up with documents.

The article thus brings a begrudging empirical description of the experience of corporate scholarship support in the schools to which they are sent. Its achievement does not lie in determining whether the programme brought about resource and instructional changes, but in clarifying the areas of agreement and disagreement between teachers and students and the kinds of records and documents needed for better programme accountability. Based on evidence, the programme payments should be linked to resource inventories and recorded, while continuing the separation between payments to individual learners and payments to institution's direct investments.

4.3 Documentary Qualification and Study Limitations

The study was cross-sectional and relied substantially on respondent perceptions. It did not include a non-beneficiary comparison school, baseline measures, or repeated observations. No inferential test was conducted, and the means should not be described as statistically significant. The findings indicate the direction and relative strength of perceptions within the participating groups, not a causal programme effect.

The programme memorandum of understanding documented learner fee support and cost-sharing, but did not verify every school-level resource reported by participants. Complete inventories, procurement records, staffing payment

records, library borrowing logs, laboratory-use records, and demonstration-plot records were not available for all indicators. The article, therefore, avoids presenting perceived resource access as verified programme expenditure.

The pilot was conducted in one participating school, creating a possible pre-exposure risk, and the records did not establish whether all pilot participants were excluded from the final administration. The item-level pilot data and authenticated reliability output were also unavailable. Complete administrator transcripts and observation records were not available for independent reanalysis, so no new interview quotations, thematic frequencies, or observational claims were created. These limitations require cautious interpretation but do not remove the descriptive value of the response patterns.

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Teachers and sponsored students perceived the influence of the WEKSCOL corporate scholarship programme on access to and use of instructional resources differently. Boarding support was the most favourably rated item, but it was appropriately treated as a learner support service. Excluding boarding, the overall instructional-resource access means were below the midpoint for both groups. The most pronounced differences involved library resources, which students rated positively and teachers rated negatively, and laboratory equipment, which teachers rated near the midpoint and students rated negatively.

Resource-supported instructional practices produced a similar pattern. Students were more positive than teachers on every indicator, particularly early syllabus completion and internal examinations. Practical lessons and self-study received modestly positive ratings from both groups, while supervision and science activities remained near the midpoint. The overall findings, therefore, indicated selective and mixed perceived influence rather than a general programme effect. The study concludes that corporate scholarship evaluation should distinguish fee and boarding support from direct investment in school resources. It should also separate resource availability, adequacy, condition, access, and actual instructional use. The evidence did not establish statistical significance or causality, but it identified resource and practice areas that require stronger documentation, monitoring, and follow-up in the two beneficiary schools.

5.2 Recommendations

First, WEKSCOL and the beneficiary schools should maintain an auditable programme framework that distinguishes learner fee and boarding support from any direct investment in facilities, equipment, materials, support services, or staffing. Every institutional-resource claim should be linked to dated budgets, payment records, procurement documents, inventories, staffing records, and handover evidence. Second, school-level resource monitoring should cover four separate dimensions: availability, adequacy and condition, access, and instructional use. Monitoring should not end with confirmation that a resource exists. It should establish whether the resource is functional, sufficient, equitably allocated, scheduled, maintained, and regularly integrated into teaching and learning.

Third, the beneficiary schools should strengthen objective record-keeping. Library catalogues and borrowing logs, laboratory schedules, practical registers, equipment-to-learner ratios, consumables records, maintenance logs, demonstration-plot activity records, and supervised-study schedules should be maintained consistently. These records would make it possible to verify and explain teacher-student differences. Fourth, programme reviews should retain separate teacher and student indicators rather than combining the groups into one mean. Teachers provide information about curriculum adequacy and technical usability, while students report personal access and learning experience. Administrators should use both perspectives together with documentary evidence when identifying resource gaps and deciding priorities.

Finally, a future implementation evaluation should use a longitudinal or comparative design. It should examine programme payments, school cash flow, direct resource investment, resource access, and instructional use over time and should include comparable non-beneficiary schools where feasible. Such a design would provide a stronger basis for determining whether observed changes are associated with the scholarship programme rather than with other school or community factors.

Declaration of Interest

The authors declare that they do not have any known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Funding Declaration

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Barrett, P., Treves, A., Shmis, T., Ambasz, D., & Ustinova, M. (2019). The impact of school infrastructure on learning: A synthesis of the evidence. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1378-8>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Gordon, R., & Rose, P. (2018). Targeting scholarships and cash transfers for secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa. Mastercard Foundation. <https://mastercardfdn.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Scholarships-and-Cash-Transfers-FINAL.pdf>
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3, 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004>
- Hanushek, E. A. (2020). Education production functions. In S. Bradley & C. Green (Eds.), *The economics of education* (2nd ed., pp. 161–170). Academic Press.
- Kapur, R. (2018). Factors influencing the student's academic performance in secondary schools in India. Department of Education, University of Delhi.
- Macharia, [initials and co-authors to be confirmed]. (2023). [Title and publication details to be confirmed].
- Ministry of Education. (2023). National education sector strategic plan 2023–2027. Government of Kenya. <https://www.education.go.ke/index.php/sites/default/files/2024-08/NATIONAL%20EDUCATION%20STRATEGIC%20PLAN%202023-2027-compressed.pdf>
- Mwaniki, W., Ogola, M., & Nyerere, J. (2022). Influence of instructional resources on quality of education in public secondary schools in Murang'a County, Kenya. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(4), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.1560>
- Ndemo, D. O., & Kwaba, J. (2023). Influence of instructional resources on pupil academic achievement in public secondary schools: A case of Manga Sub-County, Nyamira County, Kenya. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 6(2), 315–322. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.6.2.1340>
- Nkosheshe, J. P. (2024). Nongovernmental organisations' contributions and influence on access and retention in public secondary education in Kajiado County, Kenya [Master's thesis, Kenyatta University]. Kenyatta University Institutional Repository.
- Ogawa, M. (2022). Emerging inequality in Kenyan secondary schools: Dilemmas of educational expansion and quality improvement. *Prospects*, 52, 453–468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-022-09627-4>
- Olang'et, J., Malechwani, J., Murage, S., & Amuka, L. (2021). Effects of Free Day Secondary Education Policy on academic performance of rural public day secondary schools in Kilifi County, Kenya. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 8(1), 192–203. <https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v8i1.421>
- Ozcan, M. (2021). Factors affecting students' academic achievement according to the teachers' opinion. *Education Reform Journal*, 6(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.22596/erj2021.06.01.1.18>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education—Lead for learning. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/>
- West Kenya Sugar Company Limited. (n.d.). Memorandum of understanding between West Kenya Sugar Company Limited, parents and sponsored students [Unpublished programme document].
- World Bank. (2018). World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1096-1>
- Zubairi, A., & Rose, P. (2019). Equitable financing of secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa. Mastercard Foundation & Research for Equitable Access and Learning Centre, University of Cambridge.