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ABSTRACT

The Education Sector in Kenya and other parts of the world has faced many challenges particularly dropouts, which is an indicator of low internal efficiency during the past two decades. The Kenyan government introduced Free Day Secondary Education in 2008 to increase access rates to secondary education which will in turn result in increased completion rates hence increased transition rates. This study sought to determine and analyze the dropout levels of Mixed Day Secondary Schools in Bomet East Constituency of Bomet County Kenya for the period between the year 2012 and 2015. This study examined why students drop out of school and what can be done about it. This study was guided by three objectives, namely; to determine the characteristics of students dropping out from day secondary schools, to determine the school-related factors leading to school dropout and to determine the household factors that lead to school dropout. The study was based on The Classical Theory of Equal Opportunities and Social Darwinism which assert that each person is born with a given amount of capacity, which, to a large extent, is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Descriptive Survey Research Design was used to collect data from Head teachers, teachers and students of the sampled Mixed Day Secondary schools in the constituency. Piloting was carried out in two mixed-day secondary schools in the County. Primary data on dropout levels was obtained from the respondents using structured questionnaires and interview schedules. Percentages and Frequencies were used to analyze the data. Statistical analysis was done using MS Excel Spreadsheet. The findings of the study are expected to benefit the school managers especially the Board of Management (BOM), the Parents Teachers Association (PTA) and Schools’ Principals, as well as the Ministry of Education (MOE) in making decisions about efficient management of Mixed-Day schools in order to curb the problem of dropout. It was found that the characteristics of students who drop out are students who get pregnant when in school, financial problems, family factors, wars, family child labour, over age students, operating motorcycle business, drug abuse, peer influence, migration to other areas and negative attitude to schooling. It was also found that certain school characteristics lead to students dropout namely; poor performance, expulsion, and school dislike, long distance to school, gender violence, inadequate learning resources, harsh punishment and hatred towards a teacher. The identified household factors that lead to dropout are female genital mutilation, early marriages, family income and cultural beliefs. It was recommended that all the principals, teachers, and parents to undertake professional guidance and counseling courses. It was also recommended that schools and the community should support the needy students. Schools should also acquire relevant teaching and learning resources.
CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This chapter laid the foundation of the study on Household and School-related factors leading to school dropouts in Bomet East Sub-County. It thus involved looking into various empirical studies on the topic from global to local perspective of the same. The study focussed on the dropout learners in Mixed-day secondary schools and justification of the study. The researcher used sampled schools, Head teachers, teachers and learners through use of Questionnaires.

1.2 Background to the Study

It is out of the recognition of the value that education contributes to a country’s social and economic development that many nations have heavily invested in education to ensure that a large segment of its population as possible is educated (UNESCO, 2000). On September 25\textsuperscript{th} 2015, countries adopted a set of goals to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity for all as part of a new sustainable development agenda (UNESCO, 2015). This is as stipulated in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) with its 17 goals with 169 targets between them to be met by the year 2030.

In 2013-2017 manifesto, the jubilee government outlined its commitment to do away with the financial hurdles that hinder access to education. The government, in addition, promised to increase allocation to the education sector. Thus, the government increased its FDSE allocation from 28.2 billion out of the total 308.6 billion education budgetary allocation in the financial year 2014-2015 budget to 32.7
billion out of 335.7 billion in the financial year 2015-2016 (The Kenya Monitor, 2015). This means the government made a 16% increment from 2014-2015 FDSE allocation. The Kenyan government with respect to Basic Education Act (2013) has implemented the right of every child to free and compulsory basic education. The Act further asserts that no public school shall charge or cause any parent or, guardian to pay tuition fees for or on behalf of any pupil in the school. Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) was implemented in the year 2008 by the government through the ministry of education leading to a big rise in the enrolment of pupils in primary school for example, 5.9 million Pupils in 2003 to 8.9 million in 2008.

In spite of the investment, the Kenyan government is one of the many nations experiencing dropout. Neilid and Balfanz (2006) point out that the reasons for secondary school dropouts are difficult to determine. According to Christenson & Thurlow (2004), dropping out is not necessarily an all-or-nothing event. In fact, many high school dropouts show lesser forms of dropping out many years before they officially leave school. Future dropouts are absent from school more frequently than their peers, even in the early elementary grades. Koskei et al (2015) in their study on school based factors as determinants of secondary school students dropouts in Bomet County found out that lack of money for school expenses such as uniforms and stationery led to school dropout. According to Child Trends (2016), a range of factors have been shown to increase a student’s risk of dropping out, including high rates of absenteeism, low levels of school engagement, low parental education, work or family responsibilities, problematic or deviant behaviour, moving to a new school in the ninth grade, and attending a school with lower achievement scores. However, few researches have dealt with Household and School-related factors leading to school dropout which thus necessitated for this study.
1.3 Statement of the Problem

The overall research problem that this study was investigating was household and school-related factors as determinants for school dropout among students in Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet-East sub-county. According to MOEST (Bomet County, 2014), the dropout rate in the county was 24% in 2014 contrary to 17.9% as of 2006 before introduction of Free Day Secondary Education. The latter was so as a result of low primary to secondary transition rates. According to MOE (2008) high wastage rates associated with dropping out, repetition in schools and low transition renders the education system inefficient. Even though the government has tried to address the financial constraints especially by relieving parents of tuition fee through FDSE, the household and school-related factors leading to school dropout have hardly been addressed which may in the long run deny the country to achieve its targets.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The study had two main purposes. One, this study attempted to find out the household factors leading to drop out among students in Bomet County. Two, the study tried to find out school-related factors leading to school dropouts in Bomet East sub County, Bomet County and possible ways of curbing the problem.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The following were the objectives of the study

1. To determine the characteristics of students dropping out of Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub County, Bomet County.

2. To determine the school characteristics leading to student’s dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county, Bomet county.
3. To determine household factors in the community leading to students’ dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County.

1.6 Research Questions

1. What are the characteristics of students dropping out of Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County?
2. What factors within the school can make students drop out from mixed-day secondary school in Bomet East Sub-County?
3. What household factors can lead to students’ dropping out from Mixed-Day secondary school in Bomet East Sub-County?

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The following were the assumptions of the study:

1. The study assumed that all the respondents were co-operative and provided reliable responses. This is so because the respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality and thus the results found were generalized to the whole population.
2. The sample population was representative of the whole population since the researcher conducted out sampling accordingly to determine the appropriate sample sizes.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The following were the limitations of the study:

1. The study only included students, teachers and head teachers in the sampled schools.
2. It is unpredictable whether the respondents responded to the questionnaires honestly although they were assured of confidentiality and anonymity.
1.9 Delimitations of the Study

The study limited itself to only one Sub County in Bomet County. For a more conclusive result, all the Sub Counties in the County should have been studied. However, this was not possible due to financial and time constraints. Secondly, Bomet East Sub County has schools of different categories which should have also been considered such as mixed boarding, Girls’ schools and Boys’ schools but were not because there is much likelihood that most of the students in those schools come from better-of-families as compared to those in day schools. Thirdly, the study never employed tracer study design which may have been the best to obtain data from specific parents whose children have dropped out of school due to financial and time constraints.

1.10 Significance of the Study

Data generated may be found useful by a number of education stakeholders. Firstly, the government may use the data to develop strategies to overcome the problem of school dropout by going beyond financial support. Secondly, Nongovernmental agencies may use data to generate strategies to assist the government to deal with the problem of drop out in the country. Thirdly, the Ministry of Education may use the data to shed the light to the head teachers on best practices that would discourage dropout. Finally, scholars may find the literature in this study useful for future research.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

The Classical Theory of Equal Opportunities and Social Darwinism asserts that each person is born with a given amount of capacity, which, to a large extent, is inherited
and cannot be substantially changed. Thus, educational systems should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature (economic, gender, geographic) that prevent bright students from lower economic backgrounds from taking advantage of inborn talents, which accelerate them to social promotion (Orodho, 2012). Liberal progressivisms like Horace Mann termed as “the Great Equalizer” main instrument, which would enhance life chances of those born into humble circumstances. The theory demands for further going through education at primary and secondary level to which access would be determined on the basis of individual’s merit and not social backgrounds.

Social Darwinism emphasize that every citizen should be given, through education, the social status to which he/she entitles him/her to inherited aptitude (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1975). The Social Darwinism theory observes that provision of formal equity of access to education, by putting everybody on the ‘scratch’ guarantees that the ensuring run is a just one. It can document who deserves the coin (money) because his/her achievements are determined by inherited capabilities and his/her will to use them and not by arbitrary conditions like economic status (Orodho, 2012).

Children from families with more socio-economic resources are more likely to stay in school (CarvalhoFilho 2008; author references; Orodho, 2012). For wealthier families, direct costs, such as fees, books, and uniforms, and opportunity costs, such as forgone earnings from child labour, are likely to be less important (Basu, 1999; author references; 2012). Children from better educated parents more often go to school and stay in school (Shavit and Blossfeld 1993; Ersado 2005; author references; UNESCO 2009). Parents who have reached a certain educational level
might want their children to achieve at least that level (Breen and Goldthorpe 1997; author references; Orodho, 2012). For educational enrolment of girls, education of the mother might be especially important (Shu 2004; author references; Orodho, 2012). Fathers in salaried employment, especially in a non-manual occupation, and probably also their children, will be more aware of the importance of education and invest more in their children’s education (Breen and Goldthorpe 1997; author references; Orodho, 2012).

The introduction of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) in 2008 was meant to enhance participation and access of the poor in education (MOE, 2008) regardless of their social classes. It is hoped that the handicaps that are inherited in being poor have been removed. On the level of education policy, the problem is mainly seen as of providing grants for the poor and able pupils, especially at secondary school level in Kenya (Njeru and Orodho, 2003). This theory was found relevant for this study because cost-sharing discriminates poor families who cannot afford to keep their children in school hence withdrawing them prematurely. This negatively impacts on education. The day schools in Kenya were introduced as they are much affordable as compared to boarding schools and have even been made much cheaper through the introduction of free-day secondary schools. This was meant to increase transition rates from primary to secondary schools and possibly increase retention rates too.
### 1.12 The Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Intervening Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entry behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No. of teachers and their qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Form of punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Premarital pregnancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demotivated learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Early marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inability to cope with school environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Premarital pregnancies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls sidelined in access to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Boy child favouritism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework**

*Source: Researcher, 2015*
Figure 1.1 shows the impact of household and school-based factors on students’ dropout. The figure shows the interrelationship of such factors hence; household, learner characteristics and school-based factors. When a community believes in such issues as early marriages, and favouritism of particular gender, it often results in a learner’s poor performance and absenteeism which in the long run lead to school dropout. On the other hand, poverty leads to parents’ failure to pay school fees and may compel the parents to involve their children in income generating activities at a tender age (child labour). These thus lead to poor performance and learners are often absent which later result in total termination of schooling. Learner characteristics such as age, entry behaviour and even sex play important role in a learner’s performance and the attitude towards education which affect their performance and determine their completion of education cycle. Finally, the availability conducive school environment with adequate and relevant infrastructure determines the learner’s performance and the probability of terminating or completing the education cycle. The above framework shows that the presence of one or more of the above mentioned factors may lead to a learner’s Poor Performance and absenteeism which in the end lead to school dropout.
1.13 Operational Definition of Central Terms

The following terms were operational in the study

**Determinant:** An element that determines the nature of something

**Drop out:** Refers to a learner who fails to complete the secondary education cycle.

**Household:** It has been used to refer to all persons that live in any given family.

**Household factors:** It has been used to refer to all household beliefs and culture which may negatively affect children’s education for instance, household beliefs on such issues as early marriage, child labour e.t.c

**School:** Institution of secondary education.

**School factors:** These are determinants within the school set up that may negatively impact on students schooling eventually leading to school dropout for example; the school culture, resources e.t.c
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This section looks at the characteristics of learners dropping out of day secondary schools, school characteristics that may lead to students’ dropout and household factors that may lead to students dropping out of school. The literature reviewed is based on the researchers’ selection of research findings conducted in both developing nations as well as developed world.

2.2 Characteristics of Students Dropping out of School

There is inadequate literature in the United States of America regarding the causes and the statistics of students’ dropout in public secondary schools. According to World Bank (2016) Pregnancy, crime and violence, and other risk indicators can affect both the direct costs and the opportunity costs of staying in school. Teenage pregnancy rates are particularly high in Central America, and teen mothers may find it impossible to continue in school due to lack of needed supports such as daycare, while other young women may decide that it is preferable to leave school and start a family early. Similarly, crime and violence are major problems in several Central American countries, with homicide rates for Honduras ranking the highest in the world and those for Guatemala and El Salvador ranking in the top five. Violence in and around a school may make it untenable for youth to continue attending, while illicit activity may offer some youth an attractive alternative to staying in school. According to Frazelle and Nagel (2015), assert that there is rich administrative data from the United States and other high-income countries that has shown that students who will eventually drop out prior to completing secondary school can be reliably
identified in primary school, based on their attendance, behavioral records, and course performance. Alliance for Excellent Education (2009) asserts that over a million students who enter the ninth grade each fail to graduate with their peers four years later. The study further observed that half of the African Americans and Hispanic graduate with their peers within the same cohort. According to Li (2012), the boy child lags behind in performance in China as opposed to the girl colleagues because the pedagogical approach favors the latter than the former in scenarios where boys sit still and take notes during learning. He further postulates that child traffickers could kidnap lonely children to schools in China while those using bus transports had various cases of traffic accidents reported. This consequently contributed to truancy amongst most learners who are averse to studies and more addicted to surfing for online games. This is complicated further by parents and teachers who are busy to supervise students’ studies eventually leading to poor students’ performance.

Fata and Hirakawa (2012) carried out a study in Kompong Cham province through the stratified sampling on five primary schools and five lower secondary on schools factors affecting school dropout in rural area. The survey was based on dropout rate to examine the school factors. Totally 868 students from first, fourth and seventh grade were included in the sample. The study showed that students, who were overage, have poor academic achievement, come from Champ ethnic and with parents, who have low aspiration on education, are likely to drop out.

At a micro-level, family income is directly linked to the affordability of education and as such has a direct impact on whether children attend education (Hadley, 2010). If children do attend education, changes in the financial situation of parents,
as reflected by the volatility of family income, may push some children out of education. Although this may be a temporary effect and income may recover and return to schooling (Kane, 2004; Hadley, 2010). A study by (Shavisa et al, 2016) on the role of student characteristics in drop out cases among secondary school students in Vihiga County revealed that most students dropped out as a result of failure to raise school fees (41.3%), pregnancy (39.4%), peer pressure (49.1%) and lack of support from home (34.1%). The study further revealed that distance from school contributed least to dropout (3.1%) since most day schools (69.4%) were established within reasonable distance from the students’ catchment. Drop out is often a process rather than the result of one single event, and therefore has more than one proximate cause (Hunt, 2008) thus the study.

2.3 School Characteristics that may lead to students’ dropping out of school

According to World Bank (2015), school structure, curriculum and size are factors influential to increased likelihood of a student experiencing academic risk factors. The school curriculum has been found to affect the likelihood of a student to drop out regardless of which courses the individual was taking. Students who attended schools that offered Calculus or fewer courses below the level of Algebra 1 had a reduced risk of dropping out of school by 56%. Similarly, World Bank (2014e) points out that Principals, teachers, and parent committees have not been sufficiently trained to fulfill their pedagogical, management, and leadership roles, and data are not effectively utilized for decision-making. Countries are now focusing on these shortcomings, including in El Salvador, where teacher training as part of the full-time schooling model will be rigorously evaluated, and in Mexico, where an evaluation of management training for school principals is also underway. Bruns and Luque (2014) provide a comprehensive overview of how teacher recruitment,
training, and incentive policies fail to maximize teacher performance across Latin America. In Honduras, as in several other countries in the region, even basic indicators such as class time used for actual instruction show substantial opportunity for improvement – the equivalent of one day of school per week is lost to teachers socializing or conducting management activities during class rather than teaching. A growing number of randomized evaluations find that performance-based monetary incentives for teachers can increase student learning, and presumably reduce dropout, under the right circumstances. Nevertheless, a study by Chinyuka, K (2014) on the causes of school dropout among Ordinary level learners in a Resettlement area in Masvingo posits that unsafe school environment, labeling and stigmatization, too many students in a class, poor grades and that teachers tended to favour learners from affluent families were the main causes of dropout.

At a micro-level, Sang et al (2013) on analysis of dropout levels in public secondary schools in Kericho District in relation to selected school characteristics revealed that dropout is highest in form two as compared to the other classes and prevalent in day schools than boarding schools due to community influence, peer influence, premarital pregnancies and early marriages. Data also revealed that dropout was common in mixed schools than single sex schools. Similarly, a study by Koskei et al, (2015) on school based factors as determinants of secondary school students in Bomet County revealed that poor relationships between students and the teachers, rigid rules and regulations, bullying and ‘not being in good terms with the administration’ were some of the factors that contributed to school dropout. On the same note, a study by Alika and Egbochuku (2009) points out that the school administration plays a crucial role in determining whether or not students will stay
in school to complete the education cycle or dropout before completion. The policies in place will either promote school attendance or discourage it. However, several studies have not investigated expulsion, inadequate learning resources, harsh punishment, hatred towards a teacher and boy-girl relationships in school as possible causes of dropout. This study thus was conducted based on the above mentioned school factors.

2.4 Household Factors Negatively Impacting on Education

There is substantial literature regarding how poverty, child labour and status of the parents impact on educational outcome regardless of the gender of the children. Mpyangu et al (2014) in their study on ‘out of school children in Uganda’ found out that poverty is the number one cause of school drop outs; it is mentioned as serious hindering factor towards education in all the four regions of Uganda. It is important to note that most people live in absolute poverty, they are too poor to provide for themselves and in such a way they are not able to provide school materials, which are a necessity at school. So the children go back to their parents who do not have money and to save them at times they try to look for the money themselves, with time they forget about school and consequently drop out. With regard to status of the parents, a study by Chinyuka, K (2014) postulates that unpredictable home environment, death of parents, divorce, separation, domestic quarrels by parents, child neglect and unstable homes were the main causes of dropout in Masvingo, Zimbabwe.

At a micro-level, a study by Ogeta (2014) on factors influencing dropout in public boarding and day secondary schools in Masaba North revealed that gender bias also exist in terms of gender roles and responsibilities, girls often do all the household
work before and after school as this make it hard to balance the school work and household chores an indicator pressing girls to drop out of school. The study further revealed that at this time girls are hard hit by poverty, pregnancy and lack of sanitary towels, early marriages, orphan hood and academic non performance and less motivated by parents. A study conducted by Shahidul (2013) in Bangladesh revealed that if a mother participates in the household’s decision-making process, the dropout rate of girls is decreased. Ananga (2011) points out that an important aspect of the life of children within the household is the relationship with their parents, in particular the support given by parents with the child’s schooling and the perceptions of parents about the potential benefits of education for their children. It is likely that parental support for the child’s education is linked to lower chances that the child will drop out from schooling. Not all parents are engaged with their children’s education.

A study by Liu (2004) in China found out that the majority of parents were indifferent about their children dropping out from school and left the schooling decision to the child, particularly for older children. Liu (2004) suggested that parents do not want to be blamed by the child for not continuing in education, particularly at junior secondary level. A case study of a rural village in Ghana showed parental illiteracy was the main cause of School Drop Out in Bangladesh: New Insights from Longitudinal Evidence associated with low household income as two important factors likely to cause girls to dropout (Pryor and Ampiah, 2003). Connelly and Zheng (2003) point out that there may be some gendered dimensions to the links between parental education and children’s drop out with differential effects for boys and girls. For girls, the risk of becoming pregnant, and hence
potentially dropping out of school, declines significantly as the educational attainment of the household head increases (Grant and Hallman, 2006).

The highest status accorded to marriage and motherhood in many communities impact negatively on female participation in education (Commish and Brak as cited in Chege and Sifuna, 2006). Save the children (2005) indicates that cultural norms also inhibit girls access to education in many parts of developing world. Social traditions and deep rooted religions and cultural beliefs may make it unacceptable for a girl to express her opinions, make decisions for herself or participating in activities with boys of her age. Regarding the effect of early marriage on girls Holcamp (2009) in his study found that in rural areas girls' dropout rate became higher because parents consider girls' schooling as of no benefit when they leave their own family after getting married. Chege and Sifuna (2006) observe that parents tend to discourage their daughters to acquire too much education for fear that they would have difficulties in finding educated husbands or being good wives. In such cases, the cultural beliefs of the households influence their attitudes and practices in relation to girl child education. The parental attitudes determine the child’s chance of education as the parents control initial decision of a child to attend school often influence the nature of a child participation in education. Chege and Sifuna have shown that culture favours education for the boys as opposed to that of the girls; therefore boys received more parental support than girls did. Other studies suggest that social traditional environment, which is rooted in culture, creates the barriers that rob females of their human identity and social rights. In his study Shahidul (2012) further found that in Bangladesh girls with lower socioeconomic
backgrounds drop out from secondary school when schooling or higher education inflates dowry in the marriage market of girls.

There is also substantial evidence in the literature that consumers are sensitive to the cost of education (Holla and Kremer, 2008) and that fees remain a major barrier for many families. World Bank (2016) points out that household wealth affects both the costs and benefits of schooling. Wealth determines if families can afford both the direct and opportunity costs of children attending school and thereby affect the skills accumulated in school. The introduction of secondary school subsidies, coupled with the increased availability of bursaries from the CDF have helped ease the financial burden of secondary schools. Using data from Western Kenya, Ozier (2011) suggests that relieving this bottleneck would result in significant human capital and labour market gains (in terms of shifting individuals from informal to formal employment).

A study conducted by Aketch and Rolleston (2007) identified financing secondary school education as a great challenge to both government and households. Secondary education in most African countries tends to be the most neglected receiving an average of 15 – 20% of state resources. Household burden in financing secondary education is still high. In Kenya, whereas households meet only 20% of primary and 8% of university education costs, they shoulder 60% of secondary education costs. Thus, the cost is a key barrier to transitioning to secondary school for the poor who form the majority in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Kenyan government argues that affordable secondary education is one of the solutions to ensuring equal chance for all the students to transit from primary to secondary in spite of what kind of household they are from, whether poor or rich. The high number of primary
school means expansion of secondary to absorb the high number from primary level. It is on this basis that the policy to provide free funds for day secondary education came into force. Projections based on the 2009 data revealed that there shall be substantial increases in the school going population at the secondary level of education from 8.5 million in 2010 to 13.0 million by 2030 (Republic of Kenya, 2013). However, there is dearth literature on household culture and beliefs that may force children to drop out from school.

2.5 Summary and Gap Identification

The literature obtained by the researcher revealed that an interplay of a number of factors have a great impact on a learner’s probability of completing the secondary school level education or termination of the same. From literature reviewed, the learners’ individual characteristics play a very vital role in determining whether the learner completes the cycle or terminates. It also revealed that the household factors play a major role in ensuring children’s completion or dropout from the secondary education. Equally impacting are the characteristics of the learning environment.

The literature reviewed clearly indicates that there were high dropout rates in poor households as compared to well-to-do families. On the contrary there was a dearth in literature which gave probable remedy to the current state. The researcher therefore would wished to identify the specific factors leading to learners’ dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county and provide probable solutions to the state of affairs in order to help the poor households to achieve their dreams and meet SDGS.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section outlines the procedures that will be used to attain the objectives of the study. It is organized into subsections such as research design, location of the study, population of the study, sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability of the instrument, data collection and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The research design that was used in this study is descriptive survey. It is more than just a collection of data. It involves measurement, classification, analysis, comparison and interpretation of data (Kombo et al 2006). Descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2003). It can be used when collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social science issues (Orodho & Kombo, 2002). This design is considered appropriate for this study because it offers an opportunity to obtain information from mixed-day secondary schools’ head teachers, teachers and students on the household and school-related factors leading to school dropouts in Bomet East Sub-County, Bomet County. The researcher made use of both primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained using questionnaires while secondary data was obtained from the internet, journals, newspapers and text books.
3.3 Location of the Study

This study was carried out in Bomet East Sub-County which is the largest of the five sub-counties of Bomet County. Purposive sampling was used to select the sub-county as the study site since it is the largest and has high dropout rates in the county. Mixed day secondary schools were purposively selected for the study. This is because of the government’s introduction of free day secondary school education. The sub-county was established in 2010 after implementation of the new Constitution.

3.4 Target Population

The target population was all the head teachers, teachers and students from 18 registered mixed day secondary schools in Bomet sub-county (Bomet Sub County Education, 2015). These schools have a combined population of 18 head teachers, 188 teachers comprising 124 males and 64 females and 2168 students comprising 1128 boys and 1040 girls. The head teachers, teachers and students were targeted because they interacted with those who dropped out from school and probably have some reasons on why they dropped.

Table 3.1: Population of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mixed day Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bomet Sub County Education Office, 2015
3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size Determination

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

The study employed purposive sampling. Kombo and Tromp (2006) pointed out that in purposive sampling, the researcher purposely targets a group of people believed to be reliable for the study. The preliminary stage of the study was the development of sampling frame of head teachers, teachers, and students from sampled schools. The appropriate sample sizes for this study were determined based on Krajcie and Morgan (1970) Appendix 11 table of determining sample sizes.

3.5.2 Sample Size

According to Orodho (2005), random sampling is a procedure in which all individuals in a defined population have an independent chance of being selected as a member of the sample. Seventeen schools out of 18 mixed day secondary schools were sampled for the study based on Krajcie and Morgan (1970) Appendix 11 table. The population of head teachers, teachers and students in the sampled schools was used to determine sample sizes for the study. The head teachers, teachers and students in the sampled schools were 17, 177 and 1995 respectively. Basing on Krajcie and Morgan (1970), Appendix 11 table the number of sampled head teachers, teachers and students for the study was 17, 113 and 320 respectively. The derived number of teachers and students will then was selected randomly. A letter —YES was written on pieces of paper which are equivalent to number of obtained teachers and students and the letter —NO for the rest of the teachers and students. The pieces of paper were folded, put in a bucket and shuffled. The teachers and students were then asked to pick the papers randomly. Teachers and students who picked papers with letter —YES were selected for the study.
### Table 3.2: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sampled day mixed secondary schools</th>
<th>Head teachers in sampled schools</th>
<th>Teachers in sampled schools</th>
<th>Students in sampled schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample sizes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Researcher, 2015

#### 3.6 Research Instruments

Two research instruments were used; questionnaires and interview schedules, to capture data in the study. Questionnaires were administered to sampled class teachers and sampled students. The questionnaire was preferred for its suitability to this study. It is suitable as a method of data collection because it allows the researcher to reach a large sample over a wide geographical within a limited time and because questionnaires are often used to collect descriptive information (Borg & Gall, 1989). Interview schedules on the other hand were conducted for head teachers.

The questionnaires for students had the following sections:

**SECTION A:** General information (10 items)

**SECTION B:** Factors leading to school dropout (1 item with sub sections)

The questionnaires for teachers had the following sections:

**SECTION A:** General information (7 items)

**SECTION B:** Factors leading to school dropout (4 items with sub sections)

The interview schedule for the Principals had the following sections:
SECTION A: General information (8 items)

SECTION B: School’s statistics (1 item)

SECTION C: Household and individual factors leading to school dropout (5 items with sub-sections)

SECTION D: School-related factors leading to school dropout (10 items)

3.7 Piloting Study

Once the instruments have been constructed, the researcher tried them out in the field through piloting (pre-testing). The instruments were piloted in selected sample, which was similar to the actual sample which was used in the study. Piloted schools were not included in the actual study. The procedures for piloting the instruments were identical to those during the actual study. The piloting of the instruments helped the researcher in determining their reliability and validity. The purpose of the piloting was to assist the researcher detect weakness in the instruments, check clarity of the items and also elicit comments from respondents that would help in the improvement of the items. Those items that were found to be inadequate or vague were modified to improve on quality of research instrument and reliability.

3.7.1 Validity of Research Instruments

Two types of validity were considered when developing the research instrument for the study. These are content and face validity. Content validity refers to representativeness of items on the instrument as they relate to the entire domain or universe of content being measured (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). This type of validity was enhanced objectively through examination of the instruments by the researcher’s supervisors. The contents and impressions of the instruments were improved based on the expert advice and comments. Face validity refers to the
appearance of the instrument and this was enhanced by subjecting the instrument and objectives of the study to scrutiny by the same experts and their comments were incorporated in the instrument before being used in the field. The pilot study results were used to assess face and content validity of the instruments. Validity of the instruments was ascertained by pilot testing and reliability.

3.7.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

To estimate the reliability of the Questionnaires and Interview guidelines, the instruments were piloted in one school which was not included in the study namely Chebo in secondary school with a total of 11 teachers and 172 students. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) defined reliability as a measure of the degree to which research instrument yield consistent results or data after repeated trials. To improve on the reliability of the instruments, the researcher employed the test-retest technique for the students, teachers and head teachers where the questionnaires were to be administered twice to the respondents in the pilot sample. The researcher administered the first test and recorded the scores (scores 1). After a period of two weeks, the same test was administered to the same group and scores recorded (scores 2). The researcher then critically assessed the consistency of the responses on each pair of the pilot questionnaires and made judgement on their reliability. The reliability analysis was done using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) programme. Scores of test 1 and scores of test 2 were then correlated using Spearman Rank Order

\[ r = 1 - \frac{\sum 6(d)}{n(n - 1)}. \]

Gay (1992) said that any research instruments with a correlation coefficient of between 0.80 and 1.00 are acceptable as reliable enough. The questionnaire for
students had a correlation coefficient of 0.78 and the one for teachers had a correlation coefficient of 0.80.

3.8 Data Collection Techniques

Before proceeding to the field a letter of authorization to conduct research was obtained from the graduate school. This was used to facilitate the acquisition of a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. Once permit to conduct research was granted, clearance to carry out research was obtained from Bomet Sub-County Education Officer. The schools to be involved in the study were visited by the researcher to for introduction to the principal who in turn introduced the researcher to the teachers and students. The head teacher was interviewed while the teachers and students in these schools were given the questionnaires to respond to. To ensure that the teachers and students have enough time to respond to questionnaires, 3 schools were visited every day until all the 17 schools were visited. Once the respondents completed the questionnaires, the instrument was collected on the spot. This was done in order to avoid contamination of data (Borg & Gall, 1989).

3.9 Data Analysis

On completion of data collection and before embarking on compiling and coding the data, the researcher checked the data for completeness of the questionnaires. The quantitative and qualitative data were arranged and grouped according to the particular research questions. Coding was done by use of numerical values to make data reduction possible and manageable for analysis. For example; how do you feel about the reporting time? Comfortable, code 1, uncomfortable, code 2, totally uncomfortable. They then were entered into a computer programme and the analysis
was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Quantitative data were tabulated and analyzed by use of simple frequencies, percentages and means. Qualitative data obtained from open ended questions was analyzed according to themes based on the research objectives and the research questions and thereafter, inferences and conclusions were drawn. The findings were then presented using frequency distribution tables and percentages.

3.10 Logistical and Ethical considerations

After the proposal was duly signed and endorsed, the researcher underwent through several stages in a systematic manner in conducting the research. The following are the stages the researcher followed: The researcher wrote a letter to the department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum studies, detailing her intention to go out and collect data on the topic in this study. After receiving acceptance letter from the department, the researcher applied for a research permit from the National Council for Science (NCS) (Utalii house). Thereafter the researcher used the permit to obtain permission from the Sub county Education Officer to conduct research in the designated area. The researcher ensured that the questionnaires are well constructed in readiness for data collection exercise. During data collection, the researcher ensured the respondents of confidentiality and anonymity of their identities and information. The researcher established and maintained a good rapport before starting and throughout the research process while demonstrating confidence in the purpose of the study in case of any questions about the research from doubting subjects. Ethically, the researcher acknowledged sources of information. The researcher conducted research in the 17 sampled schools and avoided documentation of false information but present authentic sources of information which enhanced the content validity as well as replication of the work and retrieval of such source materials by subsequent researchers. The researcher applied statistical procedures without concern for a favourable outcome.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of data collected from respondents from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County, Bomet County, Kenya about household and school-related determinants to school dropout among boys and girls and discusses the findings. Data analysis and report of findings was done using descriptive statistics in the form of mean, frequencies and percentages.

This chapter is presented according to the following research objectives:

1. To identify the characteristics of students dropping out of Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub County, Bomet County.
2. To determine the school characteristics leading to student’s dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county, Bomet county.
3. To determine household practices in the community leading to students’ dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County.

In this chapter data is presented both by tables and figures. According to Kothari (2004), academic writing in many subject areas requires the use of tables and figures to present data which should be integrated appropriately. Tables and figures can help make information available to your reader in an accessible way. They can be particularly useful for presenting detailed information of a statistical nature. Figures and graphs help in examining trends and make comparisons by visually displaying data.
4.2 Response Rate

This section presents the instruments response rate. The response rate is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Category</th>
<th>Sample size (n)</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015

As presented in Table 4.1 it is observed that the response rate for head teachers was 94%, teachers 98% and Students 99%. The high response rate was attributed to the fact the researcher waited for the respondents to complete the instruments and collected them immediately. Response rates are more important when the study’s purpose is to measure effects or make generalizations to a larger population; and less important if the purpose is to gain insight.

4.3 Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

The respondents in this study were the Head teachers, Teachers and Students.

4.3.1 Gender of the Head teachers and Teachers

Table 4.2: Gender of the Head teachers and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015
Table 4.2 presents data on gender of the head teachers and the teachers. It was found that 56% and 32% male and female teachers respectively were investigated. Similarly, 9% and 3% male and female head teachers respectively were investigated. This shows gender disparity in the teaching force. This can be related to Radeny (2012) who states that Realization of women's empowerment through Education was still impeded by cultural and religious attitudes and practices, infra structural limitations, inadequate policy guidelines, poverty, HIV/AIDS, lack of community awareness as well as inadequate female role models in rural areas.

4.3.2 Qualifications of the Head teachers and Teachers

Table 4.3: Qualifications of the Head teachers and teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors (First Degree)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors(First Degree)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015

As it is reflected in Table 4.3 it was found the head teachers had attained only two categories of qualifications namely Bachelor’s degrees and Masters Degrees while the teachers fell in three qualification categories namely; Masters, Bachelors Degree and Diploma. It is evident that the majority of the head teachers had attained a first degree only which comprised of the 11.02% of the total respondents and only 1.57% had attained a Masters’ degree. On the other hand, 63.79% of the teachers had a
Bachelors Degree while Masters Degree and Diploma had 11.81% each. This information shows that all the head teachers and teachers had the necessary qualifications required for headship and teaching in secondary school respectively.

### 4.3.3 Number of Years in Headship position

Table 4.4: Years in Headship position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015

Table 4.4 shows the number of years the head teachers have been in headship position. It was found that the majority which constituted 62.5% was in 0-5 years category and 37.5% were in 6-10 years category.

### 4.3.4 Teachers’ Experience in Years

Table 4.5: Teachers’ Experience in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015

Table 4.5 presents teachers’ experience in years. It was identified that 18.02% had 0-5 years experience, 27.03% had 6-10 years of teaching experience, 28.83% had 11-15 years of experience and 26.13% had 16-20 years in the teaching profession.
Radeny (2012) indicates that teacher preparation/knowledge of teaching and learning, subject matter knowledge, experience, and the combined set of qualifications are all leading factors in teacher effectiveness. Findings showed that teachers with greater content knowledge in a given subject and those with more teaching experience were more likely to achieve better results. Teachers with more experience also had a greater orientation toward seeking information from students through questioning and discussion in their teaching compared to teachers with less experience.

4.3.5 Gender of students

![Gender of students](image)

Figure 4.1: Gender of students
Source: Researcher, 2015

Figure 4.1 presents information on gender of students. It was found that 59.75% were male and 40.25% were female in mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. This information shows there is gender disparity in enrollment in schools though the variance in the gender disparity is not a major. In this scenario gender disparity is as follows:
Gender disparity = \(\frac{128}{190} \times 100 = 67.4\%\)

This shows there was gender disparity in mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County in favour of boys

### 4.3.6 Age of students

Figure 4.2: Age of students

Source: Researcher, 2015

Figure 4.2 presents data on age of students in mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. It was found the students were in three categories of age groups name 11-14, 15-20 and 21-25. The actual composition indicates that 35.22% were in 11-14 age group, 49.69% were in the 15-20 age group and 15.09% were in the 21-25 age group. This was an indication that mixed day secondary schools enrolled over-age students, revealing educational inefficiency in the area.
4.3.7 Students Class

Table 4.6: Students Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2015

Table 4.6 shows the class where the students who responded to the instruments were. It was found that 30.19% were in Form one, 24.84% were in Form two, 23.27% were in Form three and 21.70% were in Form four. The number of students in each class shows no major differences which is an indicator of normal school progression.

4.4 Characteristics of Students Dropping out of Mixed-Day Secondary Schools in Bomet East Sub County

This section presents data on the characteristics of students who drop out from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County as presented by the respondents. The respondents’ category who gave these results are the teachers.
Figure 4.3: Characteristics of students who drop out

Source: Researcher, 2015

Figure 4.3 presents the Characteristics of students who drop out from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. The characteristics which were mentioned are as follows; financial problems which was identified by 110 (99.10%) respondents; peer influence which was identified by 109 (98.20%) of the total respondents; students who get pregnant when in school which was stated by 98 (88.29%) of the total respondents; drug abuse which was identified by 98 (88.29%) of the total respondents; operating motorcycle business which was stated by 89 (80.18%) of the teachers; over age students which was mentioned by 87 (78.38%); community/ family factors which was stated by 85 (75.68%); family child labour which was stated by 67 (60.36%) of the total respondents; negative attitude to
schooling which was identified by 56 (50.45%) of the teachers; migration to other locations which was mentioned by 45 (40.54%) of the teachers and health issues which was identified by 45 (40.54%) of the respondents. It is evident that the majority of the respondents cited financial problems and peer influence as the key factors that contribute to students drop out from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County and the minority cited migration to other locations and health issues as influencing factors.

The inability of many parents to raise school fees, lack of money for uniforms, books, pens and other costs associated with school also greatly impacts on school dropout. Survey done by UNICEF (2011) pointed out that there are also school factors such as lack of proper school equipment and thefts. There is substantial evidence in the literature that consumers are sensitive to the cost of education and that fee remains a major barrier for many families as stated by Crowder and South (2009). Rono, (2010) confirms in his study that in rural areas, it is not uncommon for poor families to endorse early marriage for girls to lighten the family’s economic burdens. Research also reveals that socio – economic status and retention in school is inseparable (Drewry, 2007), this is to say, socio – economic status of students affects retention in school and retention determines one’s level in society.

Peer influence among secondary students, which is a kind of a social pressure on them to adopt a type of behaviour, dress, or attitude in order to be accepted as part of a group, affects them either positively or negatively. This is to say there are students who influence others positively as they display discipline and become role models for others to emulate or negatively as they portray social problems like immoral behaviour because at this level, the youths seek to establish their independence from
their parents due to new life styles. Peer pressure which can bring about dropping out of school is one of the most serious important issues being emphasized by the developing governments of the world (UNICEF, 2011).

Several studies also found that that teenage pregnancy is a significant cause of school dropout for girls (Boyle et al., 2002). Some studies argue that there are some specific characteristics of girls with dropout status which are: Girls with poor school performance, girls who have experienced temporary dropout previously, low economic status, family migratory life styles and the consequent vulnerability of girls. Dunne Leach, (2005) argue that some unexpected circumstances of girls such as lack of social and economic opportunities and gender inequality in education system lead to motherhood and consequence dropout from schools. Dunne and Leac (2005) state that the dropout rate of girls is higher than the dropout rate of boys and the foremost cause for girls to drop out is pregnancy. Though some countries permit girls after getting pregnant to return to school, research found that the re-entry rate is not much higher. According to Grant and Hallman (2006), re-entry to school after pregnancy depends on some circumstances such as if they can get caregiver for their child and if they are able to share or relinquish childcare responsibilities.

4.5 School characteristics leading to Student’s Dropout from Mixed-Day Secondary Schools

This section presents data on the school characteristics leading to students’ dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County as presented by the respondents. The respondents’ category who gave these results are the head teachers.
Figure 4.4 presents data on information school characteristics leading to student’s dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County as stated by the head teachers. The following characteristics were identified namely; poor performance, expulsion, school dislike, long distance to school, gender violence, inadequate learning resources, harsh punishment, hatred towards a teacher and boy girl relationships in school. On the actual composition responses 16 (100%) cited poor performance as the reason. School dislike by 15 (93.75%), expulsion was stated by 14 (87.5%), harsh punishment by 9 (56.25%), long distance to school by 7 (43.75%), boy girl relationships in school by 7 (43.75%), hatred towards a teacher by 6 (37.5%) gender violence by 5 (31.25%) and inadequate learning resources by 5.
(31.25%). It is noted that poor performance was stated by the highest number of the respondents which comprised of 100% response rate and gender violence and inadequate learning resources stated by the least number of respondents which comprised of 31.25 each. Crosnoe (2012) notes that academic performance, including academic failure is often viewed in narrow terms, as an individual behaviour limited to the early life course. However, academic performance has implications that play out across life stages and on multiple levels. On the individual level, academic struggles predict short-term problem behaviour and dropout, and can derail educational and occupational trajectories well into adulthood. On the institutional level, academic problems among students can create disorder and undermine the general mission of schools. Academic failure is an early indicator of potential dropout. Students’ dislike for learning was also rated highly with 15 (93.75%) as school characteristic leading to school dropout. This suggests that in secondary school years, students at risk of dropout were perceived early on to perform poorly and ultimately lose interest in school, which is an essential argument of disengagement theory (Finn & Fish, 2007). Low student expectations for payoff to education played a significant role in dislike and dropout, which confirmed that as students got closer to the dropout stage, the hope of completing school diminished.

4.6 Household Factors Leading to Students’ Dropout from Mixed-Day Secondary Schools in Bomet East Sub-County

This section presents data on the household practices in the community leading to students’ dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County as presented by the respondents. The respondents’ category who gave these results was the students.
Figure 4.5: Household practices leading to students’ dropout
Source: Researcher, 2015

Four household factors practices leading to students’ dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County were identified. The identified household practices are female genital mutilation, early marriages, child labour and cultural beliefs. Female genital mutilation was stated by 297 (93.40%), early marriages by 300 (94.34%), early inheritance by 124 (38.99%) and cultural beliefs by 108 (33.96%) of the respondents. Regarding the effect of early marriage on girls Holcamp (2009) found that in rural areas girls’ dropout rate became higher because parents consider girls’ schooling as of no benefit when they leave their own family after getting married. Mansory (2007) also found that early marriage is the foremost cause of early school dropout of girls in Afghanistan. A lot of research have highlighted on girls' age and education and found that when girls reach puberty, parents consider it is time for them to be married and tend to arrange the marriage instead of continuing schooling (Molteno et al., 2000). Some studies argue that early marriage of girls is associated with dropouts in certain contexts. For instance, in societies where girls leave parental household after marriage, girls'
dropout might be higher in that society (Ackers et al., 2001). The PROBE team (1999) of India reported that in that country education might give girls better preparation for marriage however, despite this, parents sometimes are reluctant to let their daughters have their education as higher education raises the cost of marriage for girls. Shahidul (2012) also found that in Bangladesh girls with lower socioeconomic backgrounds drop out from secondary school when schooling or higher education inflates dowry in the marriage market of girls. It is evident from Shahidul research that if girls have higher education but have lower parental socioeconomic background, they face difficulties in getting a husband because of the pattern in which parents need to pay a higher amount of dowry to marry their educated daughters to similarly educated grooms thus resulting in early dropout among girls.

Save the Children (2005) indicates that cultural norms and beliefs constrain girls' education especially in many developing parts of the world. In these societies, traditional values and some religious beliefs constrain girls from making their own decisions and expressing their own opinions. Chege and Sifuna (2006) examined claim that many cultures favour education for boys more than girls. Kapakasa (1992) studied girls' persistence in school and found that initiation ceremonies (religious ceremony) have significant effect on girls' dropout rate when parents have more propensity to pay for the expenses of the ceremony than their daughters' education. Abena (1991) and Atayi (2008) observe that in Africa parents were more concerned about the role for girls at home as in this role, girls do not need education since they are supposed to take care of the children and prepare meals. Falkingham and Baschieri (2006) observed that in Tajikistan many girls attend only religious classes which provide relevant skills for future married life as skilled wives. Sawada
and Lokshin (2009) found that purdah (ideal) or seclusion of women was a factor for girls’ dropout. However, traditional values can be different from location to location and in this respect, UNESCO (2010) indicate that traditional values are stronger in rural areas in developing countries compared to urban areas and people often do not allow girls to leave homes even for schools.

4.7 Interventions to Curb School Dropout from Mixed-Day Secondary Schools in Bomet East Sub-County

This section presents data on the Interventions to curb drop out from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County as presented by the respondents. The respondents’ category who gave these results is the teachers.

![Interventions to curb school dropout](image)

**Figure 4.6: Interventions to curb school dropout**

Source: Researcher, 2015
Figure 4.6 Shows several interventions that have been suggested that can enhance curbing of school dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet County. The identified interventions are guidance and counselling which was stated by 111 (100%), encouraging drop outs to go back to school which was identified by 110 (99.10%), re-entry of young mothers back to school which was suggested by 110 (99.10%), regulate freedom of students which was identified by 110 (99.10%), civic education which was mentioned by 100 (90.09%), encourage parents to pay fees which was suggested by 99 (89.19%), financial support which was mentioned by 98 (88.29%), hold meeting between parents, parent and teachers which was suggested by 88 (79.28%), motivation which was identified by 87 (78.38%), follow up programmes and monitoring which was suggested by 78 (70.27%), improve school infrastructure e and service which was suggested by 76 (68.47), and finally, to enhance friendly communication between students and teachers which was noted by 67 (60.36%).

Guidance and counselling as a movement was started in America at the beginning of the 20th century as a reaction to change process in an industrialized society. Although it was introduced in Kenya formerly in 1967 under ministry of education it had been engraved in African traditional society since time immemorial (Nasibi, 2013). The Kakamega report (Republic of Kenya, 1988) recommended that schools establish guidance and counselling services in primary schools with senior teachers being responsible for it. According to Republic of Kenya (2000), guidance is defined as the offering of advice to pupils to show them the right direction, while counselling is used to mean advising or cautioning pupils who may have gone astray or out of control. It is the responsibility of the head teacher and teachers to ensure that guidance and counselling services are offered to pupils in their schools. Each
primary school should establish guidance and counselling committee headed by a teacher appointed by the head teacher (Republic of Kenya 1999). MANTEP Institute (1995) adds that in primary school this care should permeate all activities in school.

The head teacher and the staff need to realize that pupils have problems related to physical maturity and emotional disturbances. Financial Post (2010) shows that girls miss school between 4-6 days every month, cumulatively, totalling to 24 days in a term. The girl child loses so much in due course of her education unless this is addressed; this can yield to low performance. These statistics assert what FAWE (2007) indicated in their study that the onset of menstruation among girls is concurrent with decline in educational performance and may lead to drop outs. According to the national coordinator of FAWE if girls receive guidance and counselling as well as sanitary towels their problem would be partly solved (FAWE, Kenya, 2007). It is the responsibility of the head teacher to ensure that both boys and girls are well guided and counselled on changes due to puberty so as to attend school and remain at school even during their menstruation for the girls. The head teacher should also liaise with organization such as FAWE who support girls by offering sanitary towels to also talk to the girls on the process of maturation and menstrual practice. The head teacher should facilitate the re-entry of girls as girls who had dropped out of school because of pregnancies or indiscipline for the boys. This can be done by putting in place proper guidance and counselling services for the girls to avoid making them feel discrimination, embarrassed or disoriented (FAWE, 2004). The head teacher should supervise the teachers` instruction to ensure that reproductive health is properly targeted as stipulated in the curriculum and encourage the issues related to puberty and menstruation to be discussed by pupils.
He can also initiate formation of health clubs and debate clubs into which reproductive health issues can be incorporated. Mutie and Ndambuki (2007) exemplify some common personal problems that require effective guidance and counselling because they lead to indiscipline. These are: stress and anxiety, poor self-concept, drug abuse, and sexuality among others. Effective counselling should assist in total development of the student, enable the student to make proper choices, help the student in choosing, preparing for, enter and progress in a career, as well as in vocational development, as well as helping the student to make adjustments to situations in the school and at home. For optimum individual, social, and national development, guidance needs to be made a regular and a continuous activity can be effective in curbing cases of drop out among pupils.

Eagle (1989) studied the effects of a number of family background factors on students’ academic achievement. Eagle concluded that, when social-economic status is controlled, parental involvement in school had the most significant positive impact upon student achievement. Snow, Barnes and Chandler (2001), in their two-year study of home and school influences on literacy achievement among children from low-income families, found that the single variable most positively connected to all literacy skills was formal involvement in parent-school activities such as PTA participation, and attending school activities. Therefore, it is clear that financial factor aside, parental involvement has a significant impact on the success of a school in terms of curbing drop out. The research findings from Snow et al. (2011), shows that parental involvement is an important aspect in determining students retention. Therefore, school administrators should strive to ensure that parents are actively involved in their children’s school activities. Onyango (2011) notes that, one of the
administrative tasks of a school principal is to improve relations with the community, adding that parental attitudes towards the school do make significant differences in children’s stay in school. Therefore the day secondary school head teacher has to work for improved relations between the school and community.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The study had two main purposes. One, it attempted to find out the household factors leading to drop out among students in Bomet County. Two, the study tried to find out school-related factors leading to school dropouts in Bomet East sub County, Bomet County and possible ways of curbing the problem.

This chapter presents a summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the following research objectives:

1. To identify the characteristics of students dropping out of Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub County, Bomet County.

2. To determine the school characteristics leading to student’s dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county, Bomet county.

3. To determine household factors in the community leading to students’ dropout from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County.

Data was collected from 17 mixed day secondary schools and the sampled respondents were; 17 head teachers, 113 teachers and 320 students.

5.2 Summary

5.2.1 Characteristics of Students Dropping Out of Mixed-Day Secondary Schools

The characteristics which were mentioned are as follows; those with financial problems, peer influenced , students who get pregnant when in school , those who abuse drugs, those operating motorcycle business, over age students, community/
family background, family child labour, those with negative attitude to schooling, migration to other locations and health issues. It is evident that the majority of the respondents cited financial problems and peer influence as the key factors that contribute to students drop out from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County and the minority cited migration to other locations and health issues as influencing factors.

5.2.2 School Characteristics Leading to Students’ Dropout

The following school characteristics were identified namely; poor performance, expulsion, school dislike, long distance to school, gender violence, inadequate learning resources, harsh punishment, hatred towards a teacher and boy girl relationships in school. All respondents stated poor performance as the major determinant of students’ dropout and nearly half of the respondents stated gender violence and inadequate learning resources as the least.

5.2.3 Household Practices in the Community Leading to Students’ Dropout

The identified household factors are female genital mutilation, early marriages, early inheritance and cultural beliefs.

5.3 Conclusions

This study has resulted in three main conclusions as follows;

Firstly, based on the characteristics of students dropping out, it is logical to conclude that various interventions be put in place to enhance in curbing school dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. The identified interventions are guidance and counselling, provision of financial support, motivation of students and encourage parents to pay fees. According to Republic of Kenya (2000), guidance is defined as the offering of advice to pupils to show them
the right direction, while counselling is used to mean advising or cautioning pupils who may have gone astray or out of control.

Secondly, based on school characteristics leading to school dropout, it was concluded that the following interventions be put in place to enhance in curbing school dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. The identified interventions are guidance and counselling, motivation of students, enhance friendly communication between students and teachers, regulate freedom of students and encourage meetings between parents, parent and teachers and improve school infrastructure and service.

With regard to household factors leading to students’ dropout, it was concluded that various interventions be put in place to enhance in curbing school dropout from mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-County. The identified interventions are guidance and counselling, follow up programmes and monitoring of civic education, encouraging drop outs to go back to school and re-entry of young mothers back to school.

5.4 Recommendations

These were the recommendations of the study:

1. The head teachers should ensure that their schools have proper guidance and counselling programmes to help those learners who show early signs of dropping out.

2. The teachers should motivate learners and ensure a friendly communication with them.

3. The parents and the community at large should embrace education and do away with barbaric cultures that impede learning leading to school dropout.
5.5 Recommendations for Further Studies

1. A similar study should be carried out in other parts of the counties on head teacher’s strategies in curbing drop out in public secondary schools.

2. A study on school climate in the area should be conducted to establish factors that encourage pupils to drop out of school.

3. A study on corporal punishment within the county should establish whether head teachers in this area still use it.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of Introduction

Kenyatta University
Department of Educational Management,
Policy Making and Curriculum Studies
Kenyatta University

Dear Sir/ Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR RESEARCH DATA

I am a Master of Education student at Kenyatta University. I would kindly request for your cooperation in filling this questionnaire which will assist me to gather data/information necessary for my research on “Household and school-related factors leading to dropout among boys and girls from Mixed-Day secondary schools in Bomet East, Bomet County, Kenya.”

I assure you that your identity and answers will be treated with utmost confidentiality and the information given shall strictly be used only for the purpose of this research.

Thank you for your co-operation in this important exercise.

Yours faithfully,

WC
Winny Chebet.
Appendix II: Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “N” is population size

“S” is sample size.
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Appendix III: Household and School-Related Causes Of Dropout

Interview Schedule for the Principals (HSRCDISP)

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. The name the school .................................................................

2. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. For how long have you held the position of Principal? (This includes the period you have been Principal in school(s) other than the current school) .................

4. For how long have you held the position of Principal in your current school? ...

5. What are your qualifications?
   PHD [ ] Masters [ ] Bachelors Degree [ ]
   Other (Specify) .................................................................

6. State the year your school started .............................................

7. a) Give the total number of students currently in school .....................
   b) How many are i) Boys ..............................................
   ii) Girls ......................................................

8. Give the current number of staff members
   a) TSC teachers ....................................................
   b) BOM teachers ...................................................

B. SCHOOLS’ STATISTICS

9. No. of enrolment and dropout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment/Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The year indicated is the entry/enrolment year)
10. The following are some factors that lead to drop out. What are the factors that led to dropout from school for boys and girls in your school?

C. HOUSEHOLD AND INDIVIDUAL FACTORS CAUSING DROPOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pregnancy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Marriage</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Financial Problems/ Economic factors</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Community/ Family Factors</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Child labour</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Poor performance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Over age</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What are the ages of the dropouts? (Indicate the number of dropouts in each age category given below).
   a) 17 years .............................................
   b) 18 years .............................................
   c) 19 years .............................................
   d) 20 years and above .................................

12. What are the entry marks of the dropouts? i.e. KCPE Marks. (Indicate the number of dropouts in each category)
   a) Below 200 marks ....................................
   b) Between 200 and 220 marks ..........................
   c) Between 220 and 250 marks ..........................
   d) Between 250 and 300 marks ..........................

13. With regard to the dropouts, what is their attitude towards the school? ..................

14. i) When it comes to education, who do the parents give the first priority?
   - Girls [ ]
   - Boys [ ]
   - Both [ ]
   ii) If any one of the above, why? ________________________________
D. SCHOOL- RELATED FACTORS LEADING TO SCHOOL DROPOUT

15. Do you have adequate classrooms?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]

16. Does your school have well stocked library with enough space for students’ revision
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]

17. Do you have fully equipped laboratory?
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]

18. Does the availability or unavailability of the teaching and learning resources and facilities cause dropout in your school?

19. i) In case of a mistake, what punishment is a student given?
   a) Corporal [ ]
   b) Suspension [ ]
   c) Expulsion [ ]
   d) Manual work [ ]
   e) Any other .................................................................................................................................

   ii) Does the punishment lead to dropout in some cases?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer ............................................................................................................................

20. In your opinion, what is the intervention that should be taken to curb dropout problem?
.....................................................................................................................................................

21. Does your school adopt the intervention to curb drop out of students?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
22. If yes, give the measures taken by your school to curb this problem? 

23. In your opinion, are the measures taken by your school adequate/effective?
   Yes [   ]
   No   [   ]

If no, state how the situation can be improved.

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix IV: Household and School-Related Causes of Dropout

Questionnaire for Teachers (HSRCDQT)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to enable the researcher in finding out the household and school-related factors causing dropout in Mixed-day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county, Bomet County. Your response will be highly appreciated and your identity will be kept confidential. Use ticks where applicable.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING THE QUESTIONNAIRE
i. Tick the appropriate answer(s) to all questions
ii. Use spaces provided to write your answers to the questions
iii. If you use additional sheets of paper for detailed answers, kindly indicate in all cases the question number you are referring to.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION
1. Name of your school ..................................................................................................................

2. Gender. Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. How long have you been in the teaching profession? ............................................................

4. What are your qualifications?
   a) PhD [ ]
   b) Masters [ ]
   c) Degree [ ]
   d) Diploma [ ]

5. Who is your current employer?
   a) TSC [ ]
   b) BOM [ ]

6. How long have you taught in your present school? ..............................................................

7. Does your school encounter dropouts?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, give the number of students who dropped out from:

i. Form 1  Boys [_________]  Girls [____________]

ii. Form 2 Boys [_________]  Girls [____________]

iii. Form 3 Boys [_________]  Girls [____________]

iv. Form 4 Boys [_________]  Girls [____________]

B. FACTORS LEADING TO SCHOOL DROPOUT

8. The following are some factors that lead to dropout from school for boys and girls in your class?

Household and school-related factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Pregnancy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Marriage</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Financial Problems/ Economic factors</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Community/ Family Factors</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Child labour</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Lack of motivation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Poor performance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Over age</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Give other reasons that lead to learners’ dropping out of school if any.

10. Is there a penalty for poor performance in your school?

   Yes     [ ]      No     [ ]

   a) If yes, what is the cut-off grade to move to the next grade?

   b) What is the penalty if the student does not meet the target grade?

   c) Can the penalty lead to dropout? Explain.

11. As a teacher, what do you think should be done to contain the problem of dropout in your school?
Appendix V: Household and School-Related Causes of Dropout

Questionnaire for Students (HSRCDQS)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to enable the researcher in finding out the household and school-related factors causing dropout in mixed-day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub-county, Bomet County. Your response will be highly appreciated and your identity will be kept confidential. Use ticks where applicable.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

i. Tick the appropriate answer(s) to all questions
ii. Use spaces provided to write your answers to the questions
iii. If you use additional sheets of paper for detailed answers, kindly indicate in all cases the question number you are referring to.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

(Tick where applicable)

1. The name of your school ..............................................................................................................

2. Your gender:
   Male   [ ] Female   [ ]

3. Age ............................................................................................................................................

4. Form 1   [ ]
   Form 2   [ ]
   Form 3   [ ]
   Form 4   [ ]

5. What is the official reporting time to school?
   a) 5.00 am   [ ]
   b) 6.00 am   [ ]
   c) 6.30 am   [ ]
   d) 7.00-8.00am   [ ]
6. How do you feel about the reporting time?
   a) Comfortable [ ]
   b) Uncomfortable [ ]
   c) Totally uncomfortable [ ]

7. i) As you report to school in the morning, how do you feel?
   a) Safe [ ]
   b) Unsafe [ ]
   c) Totally unsafe [ ]

   ii) Explain your answer in (i) above

8. i) Is there any punishment for reporting late? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If yes, what is the punishment?
   Has the punishment led to some students dropping out of school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. What is the highest educational attainment for your parent(s)?
   i. Primary Level [ ]
   ii. Secondary Level [ ]
   iii. Tertiary Level [ ]
   iv. Higher Education [ ]

10. What is your parent’s’ source of income?
    i. Farming [ ]
    ii. Weekly Wages [ ]
    iii. Monthly Salary [ ]

B: Factors leading to school dropout.
12. (a) How many of your colleagues/former school mates have dropped out of school
    (b) How many are Boys? Girls
    (c) They dropped while in form One [ ] Two [ ]
    Three [ ] Four [ ]
(d) Why did they leave school? Because of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal/Individual factors</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Pregnancy</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Marriage</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Indiscipline</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Over age</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Lack of school Fees</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Child labour</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Boy child favouritism</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Girl child favouritism</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Related factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Poor Performance.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Expulsion or suspension.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. School Dislike.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Long distance to school.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Gender Violence.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Inadequate learning facilities and resources.</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Harsh punishment</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any other reasons:**
For Boys ................................................................................................................
(For Girls)................................................................................................................

*Thank you for your cooperation.*
## Appendix VI: Research Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME IN MONTHS</th>
<th>FROM –TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposal writing, consultation and presentation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep, 2014-Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Piloting, instrument refinement and data collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data analysis and report writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>April-May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submission of the final report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix VII: Research Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Proposal writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Internet surfing for @60/- per hour</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Typing and printing of 58 copies @40/- per page( 5)</td>
<td>11600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Downloading and printing internet material @10/- per page for 50 pages</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Piloting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Photocopying of research instruments material @5/- per page for 100 pages</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Subsistence per day @500/- daily including travel for 2 days</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Development of research instruments @5/- per page for 1704 pages</td>
<td>8520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Subsistence for 15 days @200/- per day</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Travelling @500/- per day for 15 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Data Analysis and presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Project typing and printing @40/- per page for 95 pages.</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Project photocopying and binding for 8 copies @800/-each</td>
<td>6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>47,520.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII: Approval of Research Project Proposal from Graduate School

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
E-mail: dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

FROM: Dean, Graduate School
DATE: 3rd June, 2016

TO: Ms. Chebet Winny
C/o Department of Educ. Mgt, Policy & Curriculum Studies

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROJECT PROPOSAL

We acknowledge receipt of your Research Project Proposal after fulfilling recommendations raised by the Graduate School Board of 24th February, 2016.

You may now proceed with your Data collection, subject to clearance with the Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation.

As you embark on your data collection, please note that you will be required to submit to Graduate School completed Supervision Tracking Forms per semester. The form has been developed to replace the Progress Report forms. The Supervision Tracking Forms are available at the University's Website under Graduate School webpage downloads.

Thank you.

ANN NGURU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

CC. Chairman, Department of Educ. Mgt, Policy & Curriculum Studies

Supervisors:

1. Dr. Murage Michael
   C/o Department of Educ. Mgt, Policy & Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University

2. Dr. Charity Limbogo
   C/o Department of Educ. Mgt, Policy & Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University
Appendix IX: Research Authorization Letter to NACOSTI

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: kubps@yahoo.com
dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

P.O. Box 43844, 00100
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tel. 020-8704150

---

Our Ref: E55/CE/24760/12
Date: 3rd June, 2016

Director General,
National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation
P.O. Box 30623-00100,
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION
MS. CHEBET WINNY - REG. NO. E55/CE/24760/12

I write to introduce Ms. Chebet Winny who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. She is registered for a M.Ed. degree programme in the Department of Educational Management, Policy & Curriculum Studies in the School of Education.

Ms. Chebet intends to conduct research for a project entitled, "Household and School-Related Determinants to School Dropout among Boys and Girls in Mixed Day Secondary Schools in Bomet County, Kenya."

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

MRS. LUCY N. MBAABU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

Kenyatta University...ISO 9001: 2008 Certified
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE,
TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref. No: NACOSTI/P/16/46939/13279

31st August, 2016

Chebet Winny
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Household and school-related factors leading to school dropout among boys and girls in mixed day secondary schools in Bomet East Sub County, Bomet County, Kenya,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Bomet County for the period ending 30th August, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Bomet County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

BONIFACE WANYAMA
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Bomet County.

The County Director of Education
Bomet County.
Appendix XI: Research Permit

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:  
MS. CHEBET WINNY  
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 88-20402  
LONGISA, has been permitted to conduct research in Bomet County on the topic:  
HOUSEHOLD AND SCHOOL-RELATED FACTORS LEADING TO SCHOOL DROPOUT AMONG BOYS AND GIRLS IN MIXED DAY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BOMET EAST SUBCOUNTY, BOMET COUNTY, KENYA,  
for the period ending:  
30th August, 2017  

Applicant’s Signature  

Director General  
National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation  

CONDITIONS  

1. You must report to the County Commissioner and the County Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do that may lead to the cancellation of your permit. 
2. The Research Officer will not be interviewed without prior appointment. 
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been approved. 
4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the relevant Government Ministries. A copy of the research report will be submitted to the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. 
5. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to modify the conditions of this permit including the cancellation of the same.