THE IMPACT OF HUMAN WILDLIFE CONFLICT ON ACQUISITION OF QUALITY EDUCATION IN NAROK WEST SUB COUNTY, KENYA

Jackson Morompi Ole Masago
Admin Assistant Liason Section, Maasai Mara University, MED Sociology of Education; Former Manager Maasai Mara University Mara Training, Research and Conference Center, Kenya

Dr. Reuben Gibson Kweingoti (PhD)
Senior Lecturer in Religious Studies, Member of Curriculum Development- Religious studies, Post Graduate Student's Career Guidance; Former Director Bomet Campus Maasai Mara University, Kenya

Full Length Research

ABSTRACT

The objective of the article was to establish the impact of human wildlife conflict on acquisition of quality education in Narok West Sub County, Kenya. Human-wildlife conflict, particularly human-carnivore conflict, is a growing problem in today's crowded world, and can have significant impacts on both human and wildlife populations. Rising global population pressure and associated increases in demands for natural resources have resulted in heightened pressure on areas containing valued biodiversity. Efforts to assist the development of marginalized communities, however, often contravene the conservation of these areas, preventing equal gains in the two. Inflaming this tension is the interaction between economically marginalized communities and protected fauna, which can result in human-wildlife conflict (HWC) of varying forms, including disease transmission, livestock depredation, crop loss and property damage. In Narok County human wildlife conflict poses a threat to acquisition of quality education. Wildlife causes insecurity within a locality which in turn leads to absenteeism of the students. Wherever absenteeism occurs, its results are clear: Nationally, chronic absence in kindergarten was associated with lower acquisition of quality education in first grade, with the negative impact twice as likely among students from low-income families. Achievement gaps increase at all levels. The researchers found a strong correlation between sixth-grade attendance and the rate at which students graduated from high school on time. Further research shows students miss school for three primary reasons: They cannot attend, due to illness, family responsibilities, housing instability or involvement with juvenile justice; they will not attend because of bullying, unsafe conditions, harassment or embarrassment; or they do not attend because they (and/or their parents) do not value education. Some pupils are forced not to go school to guard their farms in case of crop raiding and also because of feeling insecure.

Key Words: *human wildlife conflict, acquisition of quality education*

INTRODUCTION

Human-wildlife conflict, particularly human-carnivore conflict, is a growing problem in today's crowded world, and can have significant impacts on both human and wildlife populations. Rising global population pressure and associated increases in demands for natural resources have resulted in heightened pressure on areas containing valued biodiversity. Efforts to assist the development of marginalized communities, however, often contravene the conservation of these areas, preventing equal gains in the two. Inflaming this tension is the interaction between economically marginalized communities and protected fauna, which can result in human-wildlife conflict (HWC) of varying forms, including disease transmission, livestock depredation, crop loss and property damage (Anthony &Szabo, 2011).

Typifying this disparity of ideals, conflict between protected fauna and developing communities through a variety of mechanisms is of increasing concern, through its ability to reduce support for conservation programs and impose additional resource pressures upon communities. The role played by this human-wildlife conflict (HWC) in exacerbating the problematic conservation-versus-development debate thus requires urgent consideration. The following thesis examines the effect of HWC on conservation and development, using a suitable case study of HWC around a protected area in the developing world. Volcanoes National Park (VNP), northern Rwanda, supports extremely valuable biodiversity. However, surrounding farmland is currently under heavy population pressure, in addition to being subject to many of the existing development concerns of tropical Africa. Thus, by characterizing current HWC on the margins of VNP, identifying the drivers of this conflict, examining the consequences of this conflict and identifying existing mitigation measures in place, this study intended to provide greater understanding of the effects of HWC on conservation and development initiatives globally (Barua, Bhagwat&Jadhav, 2013).

Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) occurs when the needs and behavior of wildlife impact negatively on the goals of humans or when the goals of humans negatively impact the needs of wildlife (Madden, 2004). Labeling this as conflict has been contested, however, as it runs the risk of constraining the way problems are defined and limits the array of potential solutions available (Peterson et al., 2010). The so-called terministic screen this creates is seen to limit the potential for resolution, by diverting attention away from underlying political and governance in congruities (Peterson et al., 2002) and creating a problem where before there may have simply been an environmental pressure (Fall and Jackson, 2002; Priston, 2008).

Human-wildlife conflict has been in existence for as long as humans and wild animals have shared the same landscapes and resources. Human-wildlife conflict does not occur only in Africa. Nowadays human wildlife conflict exists in one form or another all over the world. Conflict between humans and crocodiles, for example, has been reported in 33 countries spanning the tropics and subtropics, and the problem probably exists in many more. All continents and countries, whether developed or not, are affected by human wildlife conflict. However there is an important distinction to be made between the level of vulnerability of agro pastoralists in developing countries and that of well-off inhabitants of developed nations. Crocodiles still kill people in the Lake Nasser area in Egypt and within towns in Mozambique; leopards still kill sheep within 100 km of Cape Town, South Africa, and lions kill cattle around the outskirts of Nairobi, Kenya. In terms of the scale of their impact on humans, it is the smaller animals, occurring in vast numbers that have the greatest impact. The red locust has been responsible for famines across vast swathes of Africa for centuries. Annual losses of cereals caused by the red-billed quelea have been estimated at US$22 million In Gabon, the number of overall complaints about grass cutters far surpasses those relating to any other animal species, including the elephant.

However, the larger herbivores (elephants, buffalo and hippopotamus), large mammalian carnivores (lions, leopards, cheetahs, spotted hyenas and wild dogs), and crocodiles are

traditionally seen as the animals representing the greatest threat to humans and responsible for the majority of human-wildlife conflicts. This may be due to the fact that local communities often regard the large wild animals as government property, as was the case under previous colonial legislation, and therefore feel prohibited from dealing with the problem themselves (WWF SARPO, 2005). The impact of the activities of large mammals on farmers and their livelihoods is enormous and even traumatic when people are killed. These incidents are often newsworthy, and generally attract the attention of political representatives who demand action from governments.

Human–wildlife conflict refers to the interaction between wild animals and people and the resultant negative impact on people or their resources, or wild animals or their habitat. It occurs when growing human populations overlap with established wildlife territory, creating reduction of resources or life to some people and/or wild animals. The conflict takes many forms ranging from loss of life or injury to humans, and animals both wild and domesticated, to competition for scarce resources to loss and degradation of habitat (Karanth,Gopalaswamy, Prasad & Dasgupta, 2013).

Conflict management strategies earlier comprised lethal control, translocation, and regulation of population size and preservation of endangered species. Recent management approaches attempt to use scientific research for better management outcomes, such as behavior modification and reducing interaction. As human-wildlife conflicts inflict direct, indirect and opportunity costs, the mitigation of human-wildlife conflict is an important issue in the management of biodiversity and protected areas (Lamarqueet al., 2009).

Most of the world's biodiversity is concentrated in developing nations. Twenty of the 25 recognized biodiversity hotspots exist in areas of the globe removed from modernity and isolated from western ideology (Conservation International). This unfortunately leaves species attempting to persist within the human-wildlife interface and increasingly reliant on management and human intervention for survival. Nowhere is this struggle more apparent than on the continent of Africa, home to both a rich and varied wildlife resource, as well as a growing, struggling human population (Ogra, 2008).

The developing world faces many challenges; chief among them is the need to balance ecosystem protection with the advancement of rural community development and food security (Reynolds 2001). Community-based ecotourism (CBE) may be a possible solution and can, if introduced and maintained correctly, achieve this balance by benefiting both local people and wildlife. In order to analyze the potential of CBE, it is important to first explore its evolution from mass tourism and the current state of global biodiversity.

The initial assault on Africa's wildlife began with European colonization. In the name of imperial power, people and nature were subjected to control and conquest, dividing Africans from their environment. This endeavor has fundamentally shaped the current conservation ethic in Africa (Shakley, 1996). Imperial rule ended in the third quarter of the 20th century and the decolonization process began. African countries have since struggled to maintain peace and food security and to find a path towards sustainable growth. The rift between the

peoples of Africa and their natural world is continuing to plague these efforts, forcing Africans to look beyond their own borders for assistance. Tourism could play an important role in their quest to join the developed world (Watkin, 2003).

Kenya is a developing nation with poor food security and low economic growth. As the population increases, people are settling in areas once reserved for wildlife, and human-wildlife conflict has become common (Born Free Foundation 2004). The majority of conflicts arise through crop damage, competition for space (pastoral or agricultural), loss of domesticated animals from predation, the blocking of migration routes and in some cases, injury or death as a result of wildlife encounters (Obunde et al., 2005). These conflicts, coupled with low compensation from the government for such losses have created an environment of negative community attitudes toward wildlife. The policies of compensation for loss due to wildlife have failed in many ways. Often the government refuses to honor the pledged compensation. If the government does compensate individuals for crop damage or human loss, the monies (KSH 30,000, about $400.00 US) do not even cover funeral costs (Obunde et al., 2005).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Conflict between people and wildlife today undoubtedly ranks amongst the main threats to conservation in Africa - alongside habitat destruction and commercially motivated hunting of wildlife to satisfy the demand for bush meat - and represents a real challenge to local, national and regional governments, wildlife managers, conservation and development agencies and local communities. Human-wildlife conflict has been in existence for as long as humans and wild animals have shared the same landscapes and resources. Human-wildlife conflict does not occur only in Africa. Nowadays human wildlife conflict exists in one form or another all over the world. Conflict between humans and crocodiles, for example, has been reported in 33 countries spanning the tropics and subtropics, and the problem probably exists in many more. All continents and countries, whether developed or not, are affected by human wildlife conflict (Obunde et al., 2005). In Narok County human wildlife conflict poses a threat to the acquisition of quality education. Wildlife causes insecurity within a locality which in turn leads to absenteeism of the students. Wherever absenteeism occurs, its results are clear: Nationally, chronic absence in kindergarten was associated with lower acquisition of quality education in first grade, with the negative impact twice as likely among students from low-income families. Achievement gaps increase at all levels. The researchers found a strong correlation between sixth-grade attendance and the rate at which students graduated from high school on time. Further research shows students miss school for three primary reasons: They cannot attend, due to illness, family responsibilities, housing instability or involvement with juvenile justice; they will not attend because of bullying, unsafe conditions, harassment or embarrassment; or they do not attend because they (and/or their parents) do not value education. Some pupils are forced not to go school to guard their farms in case of crop raiding and also because of feeling insecure (Mwamidi,Nunow&Mwasi, 2012).Further human wildlife conflict involving big animals like elephants leads to destruction of property which include classrooms and other properties in primary schools. This leads to inadequacy

of educational infrastructure (Lamarque et al., 2009). This article therefore sought to establish the impact of human wildlife conflict acquisition of quality education in Narok West Sub County, Kenya.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of the study is to establish the impact of human wildlife conflict acquisition of quality education in Narok west sub county, Kenya.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Causes and Forms of human-wildlife Conflict

As human populations expand into wild animal habitats, natural wildlife territory is displaced. Reduction in the availability of natural prey/food sources leads to wild animals seeking alternate sources. Alternately, new resources created by humans draw wildlife resulting in conflict. The population density of wildlife and humans increase with overlaps in geographical areas used increasing their interaction thus resulting in increased physical conflict. Byproducts of human existence offer un-natural opportunity for wildlife in the form of food and sheltered interference and potentially destructive threat for both man and animals. Competition for food resources also occurs when humans attempt to harvest natural resources such as fish and grassland pasture. Another cause of conflict comes from conservation biased toward flagship or game species that often threatens other species of concern (Li et al., 2013)

The forms of human-wildlife conflict include livestock depredation. In this case carnivorous and omnivorous wildlife species (especially those wide-ranging and of larger bodysize) regularly predate upon livestock, resulting in significant financial loss (e.g. Kissui, 2008). This ranges from developed world examples such as wolf depredation on ranched and free-ranging domestic animals (Boitani et al., 2010; Lance et al., 2010) to developing world depredation of pastoral livestock (Inskip and Zimmermann, 2009).

Property damage is another form of human wildlife conflict. Furthermore, damage to property is a common cause of conflict between human population's and wildlife species, through damage to infrastructure such as buildings, boundaries and utilities or vehicle collisions. Human death and injury is another form of wildlife conflict where human injury and loss of life also occurs on a limited basis, usually through either exposure by guarding against other conflicts or direct human depredation though the latter is rare.

Moreover, crop raiding is also a form of human wildlife conflict. The dominant category of human-wildlife interactions, however, is the loss of arable crops or plantations through wildlife foraging (Dickman, 2010). This presents particular pressures in those areas where dense human populations, land restrictions and costs prevent pastoral herding of livestock, making subsistence tillage the sole means of survival. This is further exacerbated in regions bordering protected areas which harbour significant populations of herbivorous and omnivorous species. Factors dictating animals decisions to raid could be based on a paucity

of resources within a protected area or the carrying capacity for a species within that area being reached (Van Aarde and Jackson, 2007).

Conversely, analysis of crop raiding in Uganda suggested that decisions to raid crops were not based on reduced availability of forest forage but on the increased availability of preferred crops along the forest's margins. In other words, animals may simply prefer the forest-agricultural boundary over areas deeper into a protected area, where natural forage may be more readily available than crops. Proximity to an area supporting wildlife species defines the numbers of raiding individual's willing to risk raiding, in addition to the suite of species encountered as raiders. The availability of appealing forage on the margins of protected areas is largely dictated by the land-use of these regions and may dictate the suite of raiding species (Karanth et al., 2012).

Implications of Human Wildlife Conflict

Human-wildlife conflict is defined by its effect on human actors, either conservation practitioners or human populations living in close proximity to wildlife. The following section outlines the effects of crop raiding specifically on the livelihoods of farmers living in close proximity to wildlife and the concurrent effect on conservation efforts, if present.

Livelihood Implications: Conflict between wildlife species (protected or otherwise) and human society is most often identified by the amount of monetary loss this causes, leading to significant livelihoods impacts. Annual damages relating to interactions with wildlife in the United States of America have been estimated at over US$3 billion (Conover et al., 1995). Additionally, though regional estimates of crop loss are difficult to calculate, African elephants have been estimated to cause upwards ofUS$60,000 worth of damage annually in Namibia alone. Similarly, though badgers have been held responsible for the transmission of bovine Tuberculosis, they additionally cause in the region of £20 – 40 million of annual loss through crop damage in England and Wales.

However prevalent this problem is globally, its effects on communities is rarely equal. Though fauna surrounding protected areas in African, South-east Asian, and South American countries "has no more impetus to engage in conflict than wildlife in developed nations" (Peterson et al.,2010), socioeconomically marginalized communities in developing nations, predominantly residing close to areas of high conservation value (Myers et al., 2000), are much more exposed to losses incurred through crop raiding. Finding solutions should thus be of a higher priority in developing countries, where lives are threatened through hunger and sickness caused by HWC. Specifically, perturbation of livelihoods in developing regions is exacted through several mechanisms. Loss of crops intended for domestic consumption or sale is a well-documented conflict. With increasing productivity owing to advancing agricultural technologies, the unit value of parcels of land and the crops grown on these are increasing (Fall and Jackson, 2002), especially in developing countries under high human population pressures.

Conservation Implications: The declining popularity of conservation initiatives as a result of these livelihood impacts is well documented in recent case studies. Indeed, warnings have been made on the risk of losing the support for conservation of those living next to protected areas, especially in systems where sufficient levels of agricultural autonomy allow for protest and modification of farming practices or around settlements within protected areas illegally or close to its margins. A lack of support for conservation may ultimately result in active antagonism towards conservation efforts and the resumption or intensification of hunting and habitat degradation. This may lead to retribution killing of implicated wildlife or deliberate impedance of conservation initiatives. Reprisal attacks commonly occur on individual animals in reaction to continued conflict with protected areas, such as the hunting of bears in China, elephant in India and baboons in Kenya as direct retribution for crop loss. Furthermore, conservation infrastructure is also targeted, such as the destruction of wildlife and livestock fences in Kenya, though this may also be linked to discontent over exclusion from natural resources such as cattle grazing or firewood.

Though crop raiding may induce negative attitudes towards protected areas, an erroneous assumption is that these attitudes inevitably lead to negative behaviours, such as reprisal attacks or illegal resource use. This neglect of potential moral and cultural drivers of community conservation, in favour of an over-simplified economic decision, is often made and highlights the need for a more inter disciplinary approach to conflict mitigation (Ocholla et al., 2013).

Existing Mitigation Strategies

An increasingly varied suite of methods aimed at preventing and mitigating conflict currently exist, expanding through technological advances, academic research and growing public reporting and perception of HWC. Physical barriers are a mitigation strategy which is most common form of mitigation is the imposition of physical barriers, including walls, fences and trenches. Though useful, particularly in impeding larger animals, the quality, suitability and maintenance of a barrier defines its effectiveness. Often, the consistency of barriers is limited in addition to an inability to halt most avian and invertebrate raiders. Assessments of Bolivian fencing, for example, have recommended that the integrity of fences be checked daily to maintain effectiveness, especially on steeply-sloped or unstable terrain. Maintaining local access to areas of rich natural resources could explain a lack of support for defense maintenance, as it is these gaps created by wildlife damage, water courses or inclement weather, which may provide access to protected resources for neighboring human communities. The cost of these barriers additionally limits their use. For example, electric elephant fences in Zimbabwe and Kenya can cost up to US$1,476 km-1 and US$4,000 km-1 respectively, while fences for primate exclusion in Bolivia can cost upto US$3,570 km-1. A more economical option may be the use of bio-fencing to protect crops. Stands of Mauritius thorn bush, Sisal and Euphorbia spp., among others, have been identified as a cheap and effective means of deterring large African mammals (Hill et al., 2002a; Andama, 2005) and Indian Rhinoceros. The disadvantages of these, however, include the time required for

adequate growth and the death of older plants. Alternatively, a region of agricultural landscape can serve as an effective barrier against foraging.

The planting of non-palatable crops, intermediate habitat or unsuitable habitat on the margins of protected areas can additionally provide protection. Though these rarely physically restrict movement of animals, they remove the desire to raid, by lessening the advantages of crop raiding over the risk of exiting a protected area. Changing cultivable land to pasture or banana plantation has reduced mammalian raiding around Kibale NP Uganda, for example while, the cultivation of mentha (Mentha spp.) around crops in Nepal has acted as an effective deterrent. Commercial plantations have similar effects, such as tea.

Guarding crops from raiding species at times of heightened vulnerability is a strategy often adopted, usually involving a combination of other deterrents including noise, bright colors or pungent smells? Though time-consuming, it has been shown to significantly reduce loss. In addition, this requires little or no training and limited monetary investment. Recent assessments have recommended that guarding be increased as an alternative to expending scarce resources on improving barriers (e.g. Pérez and Pacheco, 2006). The use of dogs, flaming sticks, guard towers and even donkeys has additionally been adopted. The risks of this strategy are well recognized, however, especially when guarding against large or dangerous animals. Furthermore, the associated opportunity costs of guarding are rarely considered as limitations to its use.

The successful use of diversionary forage to protect forest plantations (Sullivan and Sullivan, 2008) suggests that providing less valuable forage as an alternative to raiding species is a viable strategy. Similarly, providing alternative water sources for large mammals has reduced conflict in certain East African cases. Given its use of one scarce resource to protect another, however, developing world examples of this strategy are rare. Conditioned taste aversion (CTA) could be a viable adaptation of this and has shown marked reductions in conflict events. Though more widely used for livestock depredation, its potential for use with crop raiding species in tropical regions has been investigated with varying efficacy.

Most mitigation strategies implemented are rapidly habituated to by raiding species, reducing the efficacy of more general mitigation measures. Consequently, several studies have pressed for sets of mitigation measures as varied as the raiding tax an implicated. Recent developments in this have included solar blinkers for wild boar raiding, broadcasting the sounds of disturbed bees, the release of specific unappealing pheromones, sirens coupled to infrared triggers, remote sensing using collars and capsaicin repellent sprays for primates.

In addition to bottom-up conflict reduction measures, top-down policy modifications are also used to strengthen mitigation actions. Muruthi (2005) has suggested an increased level of policy harmonization as a means of reducing conflict and improving protection, especially with regard to protected areas spanning international borders, though participatory policy-making is encouraged over unilateral government planning. Changes to data collection policy, such as the development of a streamlined rapid assessment program for raiding (Strum, 2010), have also been suggested. In addition, modification of policy governing the

land-use of agricultural matrices near protected areas have been proposed as mitigation (Muruthi, 2005), such as the establishment of communal farms and land-use consolidation.

Impact of Human wildlife in Kenya

Human wildlife conflicts have led to human deaths and injuries, although less common than crop damage, are the most severe manifestations of human-wildlife conflict. The hippopotamus was long considered to be responsible for more deaths than any other large animal in Africa. Nowadays, however, the crocodile seems to have superseded the hippopotamus (Box 1) deaths are often not registered. In addition, attacks on humans by crocodiles are often ascribed to witchcraft (Musambachime, 1987). This may be because crocodiles often seem to be wary of humans, yet will attack without warning from an invisible position. There is a widely held belief that crocodile's that attack humans are not real crocodiles, but either creatures constructed by witches, so-called "human crocodiles", or crocodiles controlled by a spirit as a result of a curse.

Large mammalian carnivores are responsible for numerous fatal attacks on humans, and large herbivores, such as elephants, are also involved in human deaths every year, albeit more rarely. Elephants and hippopotamuses will rarely deliberately attack humans; in most cases deaths occur while people are protecting their crops against raiding animals (usually at night); when people accidentally come into close contact with the animals, especially on paths near water at night; or when people encounter injured animals whose normal sense of caution is impaired. Baboons are seldom, if ever, dangerous to humans, though they are capable of inflicting serious wounds to dogs. But they will intimidate humans – especially women – in urban areas, when scavenging for food.

Crop damage is the most prevalent form of human-wildlife conflict across the Kenya. The occurrence and frequency of crop-raiding is dependent upon a multitude of conditions such as the availability, variability and type of food sources in the area, the level of human activity on a farm, and the type and maturation time of crops as compared to natural food sources. These include birds, rodents, primates, antelopes, buffalos, hippopotamuses, bush pigs and elephants. While it is widely recognized that in most cases elephants do not inflict the most damage to subsistence agriculture, they are generally identified as the greatest threat to African farmers (Parker et al., 2007). Elephants can destroy a field in a single night raid. Most peasant farmers are unable to deal with the problem of elephant damage themselves and governments rarely offer any compensation. In most cases the adult male elephants carry out crop-raiding, while the female herds prefer to keep away from areas inhabited by humans. It is worth noting that during dry seasons elephants can also break into storage bins and steal grain.

Another adverse effect of the human-wildlife conflict is the killing of domestic animals by predators. The number and type of domestic animals killed by wildlife varies according to the species, the time of year, and the availability of natural prey. In the savannah and grasslands where pastoralism remains the main source of livelihood for many people, attacks on livestock are an issue. On a national level the losses are hardly significant, but for the

individual stock owner, they can be catastrophic. For a small-scale herder, losses to wildlife can mean the difference between economic independence and dire poverty. Large carnivores are the principal culprits. Patterson et al. (2004), for example, analyzed 312 attacks claiming 433 heads of livestock over a four-year period on two neighboring arid-land ranches adjoining Tsavo East National Park in Kenya. Lions were responsible for 86 percent of the attacks while the rest were carried out by hyenas and cheetahs. Lions and hyenas attacked mainly cattle and at night, whereas cheetahs nearly always took smaller sheep and goats. Some other smaller carnivores are also responsible for attacks on livestock.

Impact of Human wildlife Conflict on Acquisition of Quality Education

All children have a right to access to quality education free for eight years in Kenya. However, acquiring quality education in Narok West Sub County, Kenya has been affected by human wildlife conflicts. World Declaration on Education for All (EFA) (1990), noted that, generally, poor quality of education needed to be improved and recommended that education be made both universally available and more relevant. Emphasis should be placed on assuring an increase in children's cognitive development by improving the performance of their education (MoEST, 2006). Primary school education examination should aim at quality and used as a tool for measuring and monitoring school performance and value-added improvement in student (Williams, 2000). Teaching and learning process should serve as a handy checklist to reflect whether and to what extent schools have provided the right teaching and learning environment for the achievement of high scores. Education is measured through assessments and plays a key role in understanding the level of incidence of factors that affect the improvement of academic performance, which is a tool of change in students' academic performance (Sifuna, 2003).

According to GMR (2005), the quality of education provided in most primary schools in Kenya is shown by learners' examination achievement, which determines how much and how well children learn and the extent to which their education translates to the KCPE performance. It is the teaching and learning process that brings the curriculum to life, which determines what happens in the classroom and subsequently dictates the performance of the learning outcomes. This is one of the worst problems facing effective implementation of educational programs including the UBE. Arisi (2002) stressed that inadequate classroom spaces have resulted in over-crowding in schools. Many primary and secondary schools were built long time ago by both government and church missionaries. Hence, most of the buildings, roof-tops, desks, chairs, tables, floors, etc., have become extremely bad. Many village schools which were built with self-help efforts have been damaged due to long neglect especially blown roof-tops, damaged floors, destroyed windows/doors, and have been occupied by reptiles, while the children take lessons under the trees or shades. Government ought to have put some efforts to renovate them so as to accommodate more pupils but this was not done. Instead, government began to build one block of three classrooms in each primary school with approved colossal sums of money, whereas, it would have been more economical and beneficial to renovate than to build new ones.

This leads to production of half-baked students. Many students spend the required number of years they ought to spend in schools and are not living up to expectations because they have not gained the desired knowledge they ought to gain within the specified time spent. Many teachers no longer find their job interesting and satisfactory because of lack of facilities to carry out their job. The enthusiasm in both students and teachers which create effective teaching and learning is fast fading away, as a result of lack inadequate school facilities. No matter how energetic, enthusiastic and committed a teacher might be, his or her effort, level of performance, effectiveness in the classroom might not produce the required result in teaching, evaluation and management because his or her action to satisfy the motive would be affected by negative context of the environment.

Human wildlife conflict poses a threat to the acquisition of quality education. Wildlife causes insecurity within a locality which in turn leads to absenteeism of the students. Wherever absenteeism occurs, its results are clear: Nationally, chronic absence in kindergarten was associated with lower acquisition of quality education in first grade, with the negative impact twice as likely among students from low-income families. Achievement gaps increase at all levels. The researchers found a strong correlation between sixth-grade attendance and the rate at which students graduated from high school on time. Further research shows students miss school for three primary reasons: They cannot attend, due to illness, family responsibilities, housing instability or involvement with juvenile justice; they will not attend because of bullying, unsafe conditions, harassment or embarrassment; or they do not attend because they (and/or their parents) do not value education. Some pupils are forced not to go school to guard their farms in case of crop raiding and also because of feeling insecure.

CONCLUSIONS

This article concludes that human wildlife conflict has an impact on pupils' acquisition of quality education. In Narok County human wildlife conflict poses a threat to the acquisition of quality education. Wildlife causes insecurity within a locality which in turn leads to absenteeism of the students. Wherever absenteeism occurs, its results are clear: Nationally, chronic absence in kindergarten was associated with lower acquisition of quality education in first grade, with the negative impact twice as likely among students from low-income families. Achievement gaps increase at all levels. The researchers found a strong correlation between sixth-grade attendance and the rate at which students graduated from high school on time. Further research shows students miss school for three primary reasons: They cannot attend, due to illness, family responsibilities, housing instability or involvement with juvenile justice; they will not attend because of bullying, unsafe conditions, harassment or embarrassment; or they do not attend because they (and/or their parents) do not value education. Some pupils are forced not to go school to guard their farms in case of crop raiding and also because of feeling insecure.

REFERENCES

Anthony, B. P., &Szabo, A. (2011). Protected areas: conservation cornerstones or paradoxes? Insights from human-wildlife conflicts in Africa and Southeastern Europe.In *The Importance of biological interactions in the study of biodiversity*.InTech.

Anthony, B. P., Scott, P., &Antypas, A. (2010). Sitting on the fence? Policies and practices in managing human-wildlife conflict in Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Conservation and Society*, *8*(3), 225-240.

Barua, M., Bhagwat, S. A., &Jadhav, S. (2013). The hidden dimensions of human–wildlife conflict: health impacts, opportunity and transaction costs. *Biological Conservation*, *157*, 309-316.

Dickman, A. J. (2010). Complexities of conflict: the importance of considering social factors for effectively resolving human–wildlife conflict. *Animal conservation*, 13(5), 458-466.

Hill, C. M., & Webber, A. D. (2010). Perceptions of nonhuman primates in human–wildlife conflict scenarios. *American journal of primatology*, *72*(10), 919-924.

Karanth, K. K., Gopalaswamy, A. M., Prasad, P. K., &Dasgupta, S. (2013). Patterns of human–wildlife conflicts and compensation: Insights from Western Ghats protected areas. *Biological Conservation*, *166*, 175-185.

Kretser, H. E., Sullivan, P. J., & Knuth, B. A. (2008). Housing density as an indicator of spatial patterns of reported human–wildlife interactions in Northern New York. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *84*(3-4), 282-292.

Lamarque, F., Anderson, J., Fergusson, R., Lagrange, M., Osei-Owusu, Y., & Bakker, L. (2009). *Human-wildlife conflict in Africa: causes, consequences and management strategies* (No. 157). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Mwamidi, D., Nunow, A., &Mwasi, S. H. (2012). The Use of indigenous knowledge in minimizing human-wildlife conflict: the case of Taita Community, Kenya. *International Journal of Current Research*, *4*(02), 026-030.

NyongesaKassilly, F., Tsingalia, H. M., &Gossow, H. (2008).Mitigating human-wildlife conflicts through wildlife fencing: A Kenyan case study. *Wildlife Biology in Practice*, *4*(1), 30-38.

Ocholla, G. O., Koske, J., Asoka, G. W., Bunyasi, M. M., Pacha, O., Omondi, S. H., &Mireri, C. (2013). Assessment of Traditional Methods Used by the Samburu Pastoral Community in Human Wildlife Conflict Management. *Int. J. Human. Soc. Sci*, *3*(11), 292.

Ogra, M. V. (2008). Human–wildlife conflict and gender in protected area borderlands: a case study of costs, perceptions, and vulnerabilities from Uttarakhand (Uttaranchal), India. *Geoforum*, *39*(3), 1408-1422.

Ogutu, J. O., Piepho, H. P., Said, M. Y., &Kifugo, S. C. (2014). Herbivore dynamics and range contraction in Kajiado County Kenya: climate and land use changes,

population pressures, governance, policy and human-wildlife conflicts. *The Open Ecology Journal*, *7*(1).

Okech, R. N. (2010). Wildlife-community conflicts in conservation areas in Kenya. *African journal on conflict resolution*, *10*(2).

Peterson, M. N., Birckhead, J. L., Leong, K., Peterson, M. J., & Peterson, T. R. (2010).Rearticulating the myth of human–wildlife conflict. *Conservation Letters*, *3*(2), 74-82.

Redpath, S. M., Bhatia, S., & Young, J. (2015). Tilting at wildlife: reconsidering human–wildlife conflict. *Oryx*, *49*(2), 222-225.

Senzota, R., Chomba, C., Nyirenda, V., Chabwela, H., &Mwitwa, J. (2012). Patterns of human–wildlife conflicts in Zambia, causes, consequences and management responses.

Thirgood, S., &Redpath, S. (2008). Hen harriers and red grouse: science, politics and human–wildlife conflict. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *45*(5), 1550-1554.

Treves, A. (2009). The human dimensions of conflicts with wildlife around protected areas. *Wildlife and society: The science of human dimensions*, 214-228.

Western, D., Russell, S., &Cuthill, I. (2009). The status of wildlife in protected areas compared to non-protected areas of Kenya. *PloS one*, *4*(7), e6140.