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ABSTRACT

The Kenyan government acknowledges that there is need to enhance the education levels of its citizens in a bid to improve the livelihood of its citizens and to enhance the growth of the economy. Improved secondary education is essential in the enhancement of the education levels and skills of human capital in any nation. Unfortunately, in Kenya, the number of students leaving schooling without completing secondary education is quite alarming. The determination of this study was to assess school based factors influencing drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County. Exploration was steered by four objectives; to establish the influence of school resources on drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County, to assess the impact of school policies and practices on drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County, to determine the influence of principals leadership style on drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County and to reveal the extent to which students’ discrimination by teachers influence drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County. Exploration was based on the education production function theory. The study was conducted using descriptive survey design. The study was carried out in Kikuyu sub-county, Kiambu County and the target population was 28 principals and 427 teachers and 10400 students of public secondary school in Kikuyu Sub-County. To determine the sample size the research adopted the 10-30% of the universe which is seen as representative. The sample therefore comprised of the 3 principals of the involved schools which is 10 percent of the 28 schools, 43 teachers which is 10 percent of the study’s population of 427 teachers and 1040 students which is 10% of the 10400 student’s population. The raw data needed for this study were collected with the help of pre-determined questionnaires and interviews. Piloting study was conducted with a hundred (100) students from Gichuru high school. The researcher used descriptive statistics where frequencies and percentage of responses were obtained through the use of SPSS. The study found that resources utilized in the passing and acquisition of knowledge was not enough in the institutions which negatively influenced dropout. Use of discriminative school policies lead to drop out of the discriminated students. Principal’s leadership style influences the students drop-out. The study recommended that there is need for provision of adequate resources to reduce the burden passed to the parents. The government should ensure that the laid down policies are adhered to. The school management should adopt strategies to discourage student’s discrimination.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This part is a presentation of the explorations introduction with subsections such as explorations background, the statement of the problem, the explorations goal, and intentions of the exploration, exploration’s questions, significance, limitations and delimitations, exploration’s assumptions, theoretic framework, conceptual outline in addition to definition of operational terms.

1.2 Background of the Study

A country’s economic and social growth cannot be achieved in the absence of education. Thus, education is amongst the top priorities in the political agenda in many countries. Education is also a means to achieving other ends (Ball, 2017). For example, when a country has advanced in educational development she is likely to achieve other benefits such as economic growth, health, democracy and poverty eradication (Evans, 2018). The education of youth is today known as an effective way to investment in the development of any nation. It is an effective criterion that has been used by many countries to improve their social and economic growth (World Bank, 2018).

There is an interlinkage between health, education and economic development. For example, when youths are well educated they get the skills and tools they need to exercise their rights and gain access to services they are entitled to. Mothers who are educated are informed about the immunization services available to their children and are 50% more likely to seek for such services compared to uneducated
mothers. For every additional schooling year among mothers, there is a 5-10% drop in infant mortality (Keats, 2018).

Numerous global organizations recognize the right to education including organizations such as Education for All forums, the Beijing Platform for Action and the most recent one referred to as the Millennium Summit which occurred in 2018. Unfortunately, none of these organizations have provided equal and global access to quality education. Numerous agreements have been made with the goal to educate all children and ensure equal access to quality education. Unfortunately, these agreements have not been met and yet annual conventions are still being conducted and new agreements signed, but the goal is yet to be achieved (UNESCO, 2017).

The number of students leaving schooling without completing secondary education is quite alarming (Collins & Halverson, 2018). This has become a great concern for many countries of the world. Therefore, many countries are coming up with policies, strategies and interventions to enhance progression among its students and reduce the number of school dropouts (UNESCO, 2018). At the early educational stages, the number of enrolled students is very high, but at the secondary education levels, dropouts increase and the end result is very few students completing their education in many countries (World Bank, 2018).

Due to the increased dropout rates many of the school going children drop out without acquiring the needed skills at even the basic levels of education (Collins & Halverson, 2018). Hsin and Ortega (2018), did a study in the US that indicated that
13% of children aged between 16 to 24 years dropped out of their secondary schools. Currently, these children are not enrolled in any education institutions. The high dropout rates as high as 55% is proof that the educational institutions are not meeting the needs of the children nor providing for the good of the entire population in these schools (Partelow & Johnson, 2017). However, the numbers are much more encouraging in the Netherlands where the dropout rates are almost zero. The reason behind this is said to be the balancing and the stable socio-economic factors in the country (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2017).

There is a striking diversity when it comes to the provision of education globally (Shields, 2017), a fact that can highly influence the environment from which the student hails from making him/her to remain or drop out from school. A research done by Mutwol, Cheserek, Boit and Mining (2017), indicates that involvement of learners in secondary education is highly impacted by elements on socio-economic features. Some of the dynamics they itemized comprise the parents’ level of income and poverty.

Countries with high school dropout rates are an indication that their education system is failing (Collins & Halverson, 2018). Young students that drop out of their secondary schools start their lives in the outside world without the basic skills they need to succeed in today’s complex and competitive world. Most of the jobs require one to have at least completed their secondary education and one cannot continue with their post-secondary education without the high school certificate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Secondary school drop outs are
more likely to be unemployed compared to students who have completed their secondary education (Rumberger, 2018).

According to Heneveld (2016), education is life requirement for all human beings since it is part and parcel of their day to day activities. This means that education is required by all human beings regardless of their gender and nationality. There is an international understanding that education is the beginning of fighting against poverty and improving the standard of people’s life. It increases productivity to the world market (GoK, 2017). Importance of education is critical taking into consideration that globally one billion people cannot read or write and of the school going children who are supposed to be learning, 300 million are out of schools. Of the total number of people worldwide who cannot read or write, two thirds of them are women while 60% of the children who are not in school are girls (World Bank, 2018).

Dropping out of school is a big loss to the individual, community and the nation at large. It may occur at all levels of learning and has been a social problem over the world. A learner dropping out from school is of great concern for any government or society. Many policies and strategies have been developed by the Kenyan government to enhance smooth transition rate in school but there are still students who withdraw from school prematurely (Ananga, 2014).

According to Stearns and Glennie (2016), out-of-school employment, family responsibilities, disciplinary policies, conflicts with teachers and staff lead to school drop outs. Other studies addressing school drop outs are Fredricks,
Filsecker and Lawson, (2016) on pupil engagement that guided much of the research on school drop outs. Rumberger (2018) on emotional behavior, individual pupil’s background as well as family, community and school factors, Allensworth (2017) on low levels of attendance as a strong factor responsible for dropping out. There is a growing need for improved education. In today’s world, there are numerous indicators of the insufficiency in our education systems including narrowness of jobs, ignorance and the inability to cope with social and personal challenges (UNESCO, 2017). As our societies grow and become even more complex, there is a growing need for quality holistic education. This is the reason behind UNESCO (2017) sentiments that for any society to grow, survive, and maintain a proper balance there is need for the society to have quality education which will also help its people to enjoy life and be participants to their society’s economic development.

As stipulated by the World Bank (2003), every child should have a chance to complete at least primary education where they should develop basic learning skills of reading, writing and arithmetic (3RS). The benefits of education are well established as it raises the quality of life, health and productivity of work, increases individual access to paid employment and facilitates social and political participation (Ayot & Briggs, 2017).

Part 2 Section 6 of the children’s Bill passed by the Kenyan parliament in 2001 indicates that every child has an entitlement to quality education which the government and the child’s parents are expected to provide. This children Bill was instituted as a consequence of the need to domesticate the 1989 UNCRC, and other
international conventions, Declarations and Treaties which seek to educate, protect and care for children in the world (GoK, 2017).

Dropping out of school has multiple and complex reasons. Factors influenced by specific countries’ situations, educational development, unsafe overcrowding, school based factors such as poorly equipped schools with inadequate trained teachers contribute to students’ dropout (UNSECO, 2017). According to the Ministry of Education MoE (2017) there are constraints in attaining the goals of Education for All (EFA) to realize vision 2030. The completion rates in secondary schools are low due to the dropout of the students. Reports by the MoE reveal that irrespective of the well-known gains achieved through education access, dropouts are still being experienced in addition to the reducing rate of completion (MoEST, 2017).

The drop-outs of students and low completion rates may be as a result of diverse factors. According to Backman (2017) schools that have adequate resources are less likely to have high drop outs. Such schools are also likely to have better disciplined children and their students are likely to be better motivated to continue with their education. Adequate resources are also likely to enhance access and outcomes of the education provided in these schools especially because the students are available to be taught meaningful and relevant skills that will help them in their later life.

Nonhlanhla (2017) revealed that inadequate materials meant for impacting and acquiring knowledge and other study materials, the teacher’s inability to complete
the provided syllabus among other related factors contribute to dropout incidences by learners. The fiscal and non-physical materials which in totality enhance the learning and development of a learner influence dropout rate (Brown, 2007). The adequacy of resources is closely associated with high outputs in academic and holistic development of children during formative years. Adequacy is a term meaning resources have a possibility to make a child benefit optimally in both indoor and outdoor activities.

In a learning institution, resources include human, financial, material, time and socio-cultural (Takanishi, 2016). It may be seen that resources are essential in learning and development, therefore ensuring their management is vital to the children and the school. Kenya has been putting a lot of weight on the sufficiency of educational resources being offered to public schools. As a result of this, the Kenyan education sector has undergone major transformations in the last thirty years undertaken by special commissions and working parties established by the government. Through these commissions, the government has sought to address challenges facing the education sector through a wide range of policy initiatives (Wycliffe & Christopher, 2009).

To see to it that sufficiency of resources in public education, the Kenyan government began providing textbooks in schools immediately after independence as one measure of supporting children from poor families under the School Equipment Scheme (Chakava, 1996). Increased enrolment in subsequent years constrained the government ability to fully meet the needs
of schools and leaners. Apart from textbooks, state of facilities and unavailability of sanitary towels can affect girls dropout.

Poor leadership skills in most schools in Kenya has largely led to increased dropout rates and reduced holistic development in learners (Brown, 2017). The situation is made worse by some schools administrators who have been noted to lack enough management skills on how to direct the utilization of available resources on improving holistic development (Kretchmar & Zeichner, K. (2017). The leadership styles used by the school principals may thus be a key determinant of students drop out in school.

Discrimination in schools often results to negative academic and psychological effects on the discriminated students. Such students are likely to hate school, mistrust their teachers and see their teachers as cruel and ineffective especially if the discrimination is from teachers, (Williams, 2017). Howarth and Andreouli (2018) observed that overtime; stereotyping experiences result to “dis-identification” with the learning institution, which negatively affects the students’ motivation and education results ultimately leading to low grades and leaving school.

Recent literature on school dropouts proposes two different means that schools influence learners’ dropout. An indirect way proposed is the use of general practices and policies intended to advance the general viability of the school. These arrangements and practices, alongside different qualities of the school may add to intentional withdrawal by influencing conditions that keep learners occupied with
school. This point of view is predictable with a few existing speculations of school dropout and takeoff that view student commitment as the cause of withdrawal (Freeman, 2018). Another proposed means that schools influence turnover is straightforwardly, through policies and cognizant choices that cause understudies to automatically pull back from school. These guidelines have to do with low grades, poor participation, trouble making, or average performance that can result to suspensions, ejections, or being forced to transfer. The study investigated the effect of this in the dropout.

The data obtained from County Education Officer, Kikuyu Sub County between year 2016 and 2019 shows that a total of 3,023 students enrolled in form one in 2016 and four year later those who registered for Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examination in 2019 were 2,884 students. A total of 139 students did not graduate accounting to 4.6% of the students who either dropped out or repeated. Therefore, there was a need to carry out a study on the school based factors that influence dropout.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Throughout the country there have been increased enrollment rates in schools due to subsidized secondary education fee. The government of Kenya (GoK), with the support of donor agencies, Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other collaborative partners, have strived to enhance the participation and access in education. The GOK has even set up policies and interventions to prevent students’ dropout (UNESCO, 2017).
Although there are practices and policies in place to ensure successful completion of education by students, there is observed high number of students who continue to drop out before completion. According to data provided by MOE (2017), the drop out levels among the country’s secondary going children in 2015 was at 8%. This means that a significant number of students who enroll for secondary education do not complete their education at this level.

In Kenya, a few studies have been done on the determinants that lead to education drop out in secondary schools. Ndeta (2017) did an analysis on the school dropout rates among high school going children. The findings indicated that the dropout rates among these children was caused by different factors related to schools, families, peers, communities and personal. Tonjira (2018) investigated the effect socio-cultural factors had on drop out rates among high school going girls in Igembe North; Meru County, Obunga (2018) study revealed factors leading to drop out rates in Malanga zone-Siaya county in Kenya, Kiragu (2017) examined the factors leading to gender disparity in education in Kajiado county, specifically Girl-child school drop-out.

The examined studies looked into the social - economic factors influencing school drop- out. The researcher acknowledges that limited studies have been conducted to assess the school based factors influencing drop-out specifically in Kiambu County. Kiambu County is characterized by high secondary school dropout rates like any other part in the country and hence the need to examine the school based factors influencing the drop-out. This exploration pursued to seal the acquaintance
gap through the assessment of features from the school that impact learners dropout in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

1.4 **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this exploration was to evaluate institution based factors influencing students’ dropout rate in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County, to have solutions that can reduce the problem.

1.5 **Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of this study were;

i) To establish the influence of school resources on students’ dropout rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

ii) To assess the influence of School policies and practices on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iii) To determine the influence of principal’s leadership style on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iv) To establish the extent to which students’ discrimination by teachers influence students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.
1.6 Research Questions

The research sought to provide answers to the below questions:

i) What is the influence of school resources on students’ drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

ii) To what extent do school policies and practices influence students’ drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

iii) What is the influence of principal’s leadership style on students’ drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

iv) To what extent does students’ discrimination by teachers influence students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

1.7 Significance of the Study

The findings of the current research may be of use to the planners, in formulating policies to minimize drop-out amid learners in secondary institutions. As the policy makers, the education administrators and educational agencies may be helped by the study to better understand school based dynamics that determines students’ dropout in secondary institutions so that they look for ways of curbing it.

The study revealed the school based aspects responsible for the learners’ drop-out in public secondary institutions study and as such may help school administrators including the committee, board of governors and teaching fraternity to look for ways of curbing the problem of drop-out rates.

Due to gaps existence in studies on institutional elements influencing learners’ drop-out rate in public secondary, this study will be an addition to the growing
body of knowledge on school based features manipulating learners’ drop-out in public secondary institutions. The study could form part of the relevant educational data for prospect exploration.

The society and the learners may benefit from the study by understanding the factors that lead to dropout and may help to control or prevent some of the factors from causing dropout.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The exploration adopted a questionnaire as the tool for collection of data. The researcher was limited when it came to the control she had on the answers given by the respondents as they filled the questionnaires. The answering of questions was heavily relied on respondents’ honesty. The researcher earnestly pleaded with them to be honest. Some might have feared to give information although confidentiality was guaranteed to them. Firm assurance was given to them to alleviate the fear by affirming to them that the research is purely for education purposes.

The participants may have been reluctant to provide adequate data due to fear of intimidation by their institutions. The researcher enlightened the respondents that the research was done only for academic reasons so as to do away with confidentiality fears the respondents may have and in a bid to improve the gathering of more relevant and accurate information.

Also the school based factors that influence students’ dropout are many hence the researcher concentrated on a few namely, school resources, school policies and practices, principal’s leadership styles and students’ discrimination by teachers.
1.9 Delimitations of the Study

The exploration was steered in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County but may fail to reflect the situations of secondary institutions in the entire parts of the country.

1.10 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that;

i) All the data given by the respondents were honest, truthful and genuine.

ii) There are school based factors which influence student drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iii) The respondents were available to fill the questionnaire.

iv) The chosen school based factors have an influence on students dropout in public secondary schools.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

Education function theory advanced by Mace (1979) was the foundation under which the current exploration was grounded on. The functionalist theory of education focuses on how education serves the needs of society through development of skills, encouraging social cohesion and sorting of students. According to functionalists, the role of schools is to prepare students for participation in the institutions of society.

The theory observes education as a normal process which involves the conversion of inputs to outputs. It is an industry by which the learners become the inputs and are converted to complete products. The function consequently depicts the
interaction amid variables. The variables can be school resources, school policies and practices, principal’s leadership style level and students’ discrimination by teachers which are some of the school based factors influencing pupils’ wastage.

Without school resources, friendly school policies and practices, good principal’s leadership style and with students’ discrimination by teachers, it is indeed very difficult to create a child friendly environment hence this can result in students dropping out of institutions. When the variables in this function interact well with the students’ in the teaching/learning environment, students are able to complete certain level of education having acquired certain level of knowledge and skills. This study on school based aspects prompting scholars drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County to help come up with ways of curbing the drop-out in the institutions.

1.12 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework in page 11 indicates variable interrelationships on the school based factors influencing learners to withdraw from secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Dependent variable in this study was drop-out in Secondary institutions. Independent variables were school resources, school policies and practices, Principal’s leadership style and students’ discrimination by teachers.
School based factors

School Resources
- Text books
- Teachers
- Sanitary and toilet facilities
- Non-teaching staff

School Policies and Practices
- Discipline practices
- Discipline policies
- Performance policies

Principal’s Leadership Style
- Dictatorial leadership
- Autocratic leadership
- Transformational leadership

Students’ Discrimination by Teachers
- Discrimination by performance
- Discrimination by discipline policies

Independent Variables

Dependent Variable

Students’ Drop-Out rate
- Dropout rate will reduce

Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework
(Source, Author 2019)

School resources pertain to the teaching, learning and education support resources that are critical in determination of the completion of education in the institutions.
For instance, since the enrollment rates in the public high schools were too high, the students had to share textbooks in the ratio of one textbook to five learners. Sharing of passing and acquiring knowledge assets impacts the learner’s ability to access the resources they need at home. This prompts them to do their homework very early in the morning when they arrive at school rather than doing it at the comfort of their homes. This leads to decreased learning motivation levels and poor performance in the student’s tests. This may end up fueling their decision to drop out of school. The school resources were assessed in terms of the adequacy and quality of the resources.

School policies and practices are made to regulator on the techniques of practices conducted in addition to their completion modes. The institutions also make their specified policies and practices to govern the school operations and behaviors. Institutions can reduce the risk of students dropping out through their policies and practices and by enhancing students’ engagement in school (Rumberger & Lim, 2018).

Leadership style could be described in various ways. It refers to the underlying needs of the leader that motivate his behaviour (Siskin, 1994). It is also a process through which persons or group influence others in the attainment of group goals (Adeyemi, 2006). Thus in the school context, it can be referred to the process through which principals influences teachers, subordinate staff and students to attain the institutional goals.
The heads are the managers of the institutions therefore have numerous responsibilities on their shoulders. They ought to be accountable, and possess management skills. In addition, they are obliged to see to it that all the activities of the institutions are done with accordance to the postulated guidelines and for the best interests of the learners. Failure to do this might be a reason behind learners’ withdrawal from the institutions (Wango, 2017).

Students’ discrimination by teachers emanates from teachers’ attitudes. Teachers’ attitudes towards their work, the management of the classes and the way the teachers interact with their learners greatly impact the student’s achievements academically and their retention rates in the schools. There have been few cases where the negative attitude of Kenyan teachers has led students to leave schools. The learners reported cases of abuse, neglect, mis-handling and being chased from their classrooms by their teachers during learning. Such behavior from teachers does not encourage learning and can lead the students to resent school. The result is increased cases of absenteeism, high dropout rates and poor academic performance (Evans, 2018).
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

**Drop out** – The withdrawal of a student from school without completing their secondary school level and the student fails to enroll back to the school to complete their education.

**Dropout rates** – The total percentage of learners who withdraw from learning institutions before they complete their education in secondary schools against the learners enrolled in these high schools in form one.

**Policies** - Refers to a course or principle of action adopted or proposed by institutions to govern the institutions.

**Principal's Leadership Style** – This is the way in which the principal administers/leads the school which may have an influence on the drop-out.

**School based factors** – These are the school factors which may influence the student to drop out rate namely; school resources, school policies and practices, students’ discrimination by teachers and principals leadership styles.

**School Resources** – Refers to the tangible and intangible human and institutional resources in the school that support education such as learning materials, financial resources, human resources equipment and infrastructure.

**Students’ Discrimination by Teachers** – Refers to teachers discriminating some students over others which influence the students’ drop-out.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter encompasses the literature review on school based factors influencing withdrawal of learners from secondary institutions. The chapter presents; school resources and drop-out, School policies and practices on drop-out, principals’ leadership on drop-out, Students’ discrimination by teachers influence drop-out and the summary of literature reviewed.

2.2 School Resources and Dropout

Teachers as human resources in the institutions assume a noteworthy job on understudies' fulfillment rate in institutions. As the human resource in the learning institutions, their role in the institutions is crucial. The increased numbers of learners in these schools have not been matched with well prepared and enough educators in the schools. Government freezing of new recruitment of teachers still remains (Francis, 2018). This makes the proportion between teacher and students worse.

A study carried out in South Africa established that supply of adequate human resources; teachers, parents and relevant education policymakers, play equipment, financial resources and enough time allocation to school activities is important to learning. Children of grades four to seven who also came from families with access to these resources, performed better than their counterparts in science and mathematics activity areas. It is important to observe that reviewed literature
show Sub-Saharan African countries as those nations with increasing poverty and international debt (Case & Ardington, 2016).

Other factors that negatively impact on the retention rates of learners and the holistic education of students include the poor earnings paid to teachers and the absence of proper accommodation for teachers (Thomas, 2017). The continuation of the freezing of the teachers employment negatively affects the quality of education considering that the enrollment of learners continue to rise although legislators have provided the piecemeal enrollment of educators, this is not a satisfactorily move that can meet the deficiencies felt in both primary and tertiary educational institutions (Partelow & Johnson, 2017).

Okemwa (2018) points out that the lack of proper sanitary facilities and toilets in educational institutions negatively impacts the retention rates among girls in schools due to their menstruation cycles. Such students are forced to stay at home until their cycle ceases. For most schools, there are no separate toilets for girls and boys which is discouraging for girls especially those already experiencing their monthly cycles (Okemwa, 2018).

The provided sanitary facilities are often dirty which can be a health hazard for these girls. Additionally, their lack of privacy leads to increased dropout rates among their children. Girls are also subjected to sexual harassment when they are visiting or after visiting the toilet (Lloyd & Hewett, 2019). As explained by Huisman, Rani and Smits (2017), schools should have separate toilets for girls and boys to address the safety issue among the girls’ students in schools.
Mwikali (2015) assessed the determinants of secondary school dropout rate in Gilgil division of Naivasha district. Questionnaire was used as a research instrument for each selected participant in the study. The selected study design was descriptive research design. The major findings of the study as the determinants of secondary school dropout rate were lack of adequate school resources. The essential school resources that lacked in the schools included clean toilets, and adequate classrooms.

There is considerable debate in the research community about the extent to which school resources contribute to school effectiveness (Rumberger & Thomas, 2016). Several studies suggest that resources influence school dropout rates. Two studies found that the pupil/teacher ratio had a positive and significant effect on high school dropout rates even after controlling for a host of individual and contextual factors that might also influence dropout rates. One of those studies found that the higher the quality of the teachers as perceived by students, the lower the dropout rate, while the higher the quality of teachers as perceived by the principal, the higher the dropout rate (Rumberger & Thomas, 2016).

Factors within schools, for example, practices and schooling relations determine whether a student drops out of secondary school (Papalia, 2015). If teachers are not effective, then students might drop out of school. Teachers’ effectiveness is influenced by teachers’ quality and academic performance, teaching load, availability of basic facilities and resource and teacher pupil ratio (Sifuna, 2014). He also stated that unconducive school environment ejects students out of
school, namely poor performance, repetition, corporal punishment, uncompromising teaching staff and lack of facilities can cause school dropout. Student-teacher ratios were significant predictors of dropout rates. According to McNeal (2014) larger student-teacher ratios may increase a student’s likelihood of dropping out by decreasing the number of interactions between pupils and teachers. Schools with larger ratios may make it difficult for at-risk pupils to seek help. McNeal (2014) found that the student/teacher ratio at a school significantly affects a student’s likelihood of dropping out.

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 (2014) 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. Ackers (2016) provide a comprehensive overview of how teacher recruitment, training,
and incentive policies fail to maximize teacher performance across Latin America.

2.3 School Policies and Practices on Drop-Out

The learning institutions policies and practices also affect the decisions of students to leave school. Rules that have to do with misbehavior, expulsion, low grades, forced transfers, being overage, suspensions and poor attendance (Freeman & Simonsen, 2018). Dropout rate in such a case is school-initiated compared to the dropout rate that was discussed earlier that was student initiated. This perspective looks at both the school and the student as contributing factors to the dropout rates among students.

A statement often given in regard to these factors says that students drop out of schools, institutions discharge students (Reche, 2017). There have been several case studies that have been done showing the way learning institutions contribute to the increased involuntary leave of students from schools, especially due to expulsion and suspension of naughty and problematic students (Fine, 2018). Most people believe that school policies and practices can improve the performance of schools and that they are the only factors that can build effective learning institutions.

According to past studies done on the measurers used to quantify academic and social performance of schools, the attendance rates and the taking of advanced courses were some of the measurers use to quantify performance. The studies found that the perceptions of students when it came to policies on fair discipline
were a good prediction of school dropout rates. This was done after controlling the student’s background traits and the institutions resource and structural traits (Rumberger & Thomas, 2018).

In another study that used similar data sets but differing variables and statistics methods indicated that there was no impact of academic and social climate on the dropout rates among secondary education students even after the students’ background traits and institutions structure, resources and social characteristics were controlled (Gaias & Bradshaw, 2018). The available research on the topic of school dropouts indicate that student withdrawal is affected by two factors. The indirect factors include the general policies and practices provided in a bid to improve the effectiveness of the educational institutions.

Such policies and practices when coupled by other school related factors can lead to the voluntarily leaving of students from their schools. This view is in agreement with other school dropout related theories that explain that the engagement of learners is a precursor when it comes to voluntarily withdrawal of students from schools (Hunt, 2018).

According to studies commissioned by Indian government planning commission in 2000 to compare the trend of enrolment and attendance in period before and after midday meal program was implemented in selected states, the results showed success of the program in raising enrolment and attendance rates.
Afridi (2017) looked into the feeding programme effects on enrolment and dropout of school in Madhya Pradesh, India where out of the 74 schools studied the attendance was found to have increased by 10.5% in schools which implemented the feeding programme. Therefore, provision of school meal increases participation. This also implies that where meals are not provided and parents cannot afford to pay for it children opt to stay at home decreasing participation rate.

Ahmed (2014) noticed that after the education administration of Bangladesh started a school feeding program by the World Food Program (WFP) in incessantly nourishment communities, a year after commencement enrollment expanded by 14.2% while mean participation per learner expanded by 1.34 school days of the month. The likelihood of dropping out of school diminished by 7.5% in schools with the feeding program intercession.

Ahmed (2014) found that school feeding program intervention in Burkina Faso had a statistical significant impact on overall enrolment. Schools increased enrolment by 6.2%. A randomised study of pre-school feeding program in Kenya showed a 30% increase in school participation. According to Lee and Burkina (2001) provision of food through school feeding program has showed to have impact upon a student decision to remain in school or drop out. They also noted school tend to see more dropouts due to shortage of food.

World Bank (2014) has encouraged that despite that a few nations in sub-Saharan Africa have disposed of school expenses, critical expenses remain, including cost
of giving uniform to a learner, students are less inclined to be sent away from school for inability to wear school uniform yet at the same time learners feel disparaged by inability to wear uniform and might be denounced by teachers.

In Uganda Stasavage, 2015 and in Ethiopia World Bank, 2014 parent who couldn't bear to purchase uniform and books for reading held their children at home in this manner influencing dropout. In Kenya it is a policy that learners ought to be school uniform. A few families are compelled to pull back their kids from school because of absence of school uniform. This has basically, influenced individuals from poor foundations (World Bank, 2014). Uniform makes all learners to be equivalent, those without feel sub-par and segregated from others. This influences their cooperation in school and some opt to dropout (GOK, 2014), Kremer and Ngatia (2016) assessed an arbitrary sample that offers uniform to understudies in Busia region, Kenya. They found that there were improvement in participation and execution for learners who got school uniform.

Craft (2013) in his investigation of southern Malawi shows that kids perform family and horticultural obligations with schooling. The investigation demonstrated that types of child labour make pressure on a learners’ time and these learners have poor school participation or lateness. Backman (2017) said in their investigation completed in five unique nations that farming work is frequently occasional which conflicts with school timetables, prompting regular withdrawal from school. In spite of the fact that these withdrawals are not permanent, research proposes that they may prompt permanent withdrawal from school.
As per UNICEF report (2014) Households in Sub-Saharan nations demonstrated that 31% of children of age somewhere in the range of 5 and 14 were occupied with child labor so as to enhance family salary so they could bear to meet the cost of education. The overview uncovers that 788,000 children of school going age were working children associated with work didn't go to formal classes as often as possible.

As indicated by UNESCO (2017) child labour has become key for family endurance. This is on the grounds that high poverty levels of guardians and hidden cost of education must be met by the children, guardians sees the advantages of education as minimal and opt for involving their children in casual labour where income is obtained faster.

According to Survey conducted by Mannaan and Dar (2017) in rural India, the major reason for non-enrolment is parent’s perception of economic opportunities for children and quality of education, as most important reason explaining drop out accounting for 51% of non-enrolment.

In Ghana, government subsidizing takes care of part of the expense of instruction, senior secondary learning relies vigorously upon cost sharing as an approach choice to enhance public finance. Such strategies are harming to the poor family units and numerous cases are accounted for where interest for training are impacted by the foreseen cost among poor families. For them education is one of the numerous choices of venture. Individuals figure the misfortune and profit and
choose where to coordinate their resources. Consequently, high instructive expense can result to learners non-enrolment and dropping out (Boyle et al., 2015).

In addition, the more education provision depends on household financial obligation relates more on the quality of education the student can acquire which is determined by the ability of the parent to bear the price. According to Fine (2018), many parents withdraw their children from school to supplement family income and production mainly between the age of 13 and 15 years due to high poverty. Often children leave school to contribute to family income by engaging in housework, on the family business or by working for wages.

Matage, Kyalo and Shadrack (2015) carried out a study on factors influencing educational dropout rate in secondary schools in Kenya, a case study of Kisii. Some of the factors investigated in this study were; cultural factors, economic factors and social factors. Stratified random sampling was used to sample schools. The respondents in the study were elected purposively and data was analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The examination uncovered that monetary factors, for example, destitution at family unit level, social factors, for example, pregnancy and relationships were liable for dropout. School related elements like school assessment guidelines and social factors, for example, arrangement of sanitary towels were found to influence instruction drop-out rate undesirably.

In spite of the fact that learners and family qualities represent the vast majority of the inconstancy in dropout rates, around 20 percent can be ascribed to four
attributes of schools: the organization of the learners’ body, assets, and approaches and practices (Rumberger, 2016). Research led by Rumberger (2016) shows that the chances of dropping out are lower in schools with more advantaged learners, yet the impacts are indirect through the relationship with other school qualities.

Research doesn't show that school size consistently affects dropout and graduation rates. Going to a Catholic secondary school improves the chances of graduating; yet considers have likewise discovered that Catholic and other non-public schools lose the same number of learners as government funded schools since learners going to private based schools ordinarily move to state funded schools as opposed to dropping out. Generally, scarcely any investigations discovered critical impacts of school assets on dropout and graduation rates, in any event in secondary school. Yet, there is solid proof that small classes improve secondary school graduation rates (Rumberger, 2016).

Students are less likely to dropout if they attend schools with a stronger academic climate, as measured by more students taking academic courses and doing homework. On the other hand, students are more likely to dropout in schools with a poor disciplinary climate, as measured by student disruptions in class or in school (Mcmillen, 2017; Rosenthal, 2014). There does not appear to be a consistent effect of exit exams on dropout rates, although more recent high school exams appear to lower high school completion rates. Additionally, requiring students to attend school beyond age 16 leads to lower dropout and higher completion rates (Rumberger, 2016).
Communities play a crucial role in adolescent development along with families, schools, and peers. Rumberger further argued that Population characteristics of communities are associated with dropping out, but not in a straightforward manner: living in a high poverty neighbourhood is not necessarily detrimental to completing high school, but rather living in an affluent neighbourhood is beneficial to school success. This suggests that affluent neighbourhoods provide more access to community resources and positive role models from affluent neighbours.

Other school-based factors leading to dropout in schools include teacher-student conflicts, poor methods of teaching, excessive punishments; excessive homework, over-crowded schools, inaccessibility and costly school requirements. The girls and their parents are also discouraged by absence of female teachers who act as their role models (Kane, 2014). The distances to the nearest school in Kenya have been reduced as compared to other countries of similar income level, even though not in all the regions.

Areas having low population have few schools, while highly populated areas have more schools which leads to difference in enrolment rates in these regions (Glennerster, Kremer, Mbiti, Takavarasha, 2011). It is therefore important to reduce the distance, which deters access to social services, to schools in low population areas in order to help boost educational access to pupils in these regions. The school environment, indiscipline, sexual harassment of girls by male counterparts and some teachers and unfavorable home environment were some causes of dropout in the area.
Ananga (2014) accepts the fact that the school exerts a powerful influence on children’s achievement, and its characteristics have an impact on the dropout rates. In studies in Kenya, UNESCO (2015 and 2011); Kiveu (2013); Oketch and Rolleston (2017) found out that a wide variety of school related cases influence school dropout. Explicitly factors such as teacher attitude, grade repetition, corporal punishment, difficulty in learning and being over age for school grade were seen to be among internal factors that affect school dropout at the basic education in Kenya.

Research findings point out that distance to school is an important determinant of educational access and dropout. For example, cases in which there are more primary than secondary schools in the locality, and in which the only secondary is further away (Fentiman, Hall, & Bundy, 2015), the distance to the latter may be considered too far for younger children, especially girls (Murugi, 2018). This is also true in the cases of older girls and those children regarded by parents as vulnerable to sexual harassment (Colclough et al., 2013; Nekatibeb, 2012; PROBE, 2013).

One internal factor that finds meaning in the theories that influence school dropout is the issue of academic performance. Regarding this, Colclough et al (2013) emphasise that poor academic results are associated with high levels of grade repetition and dropout, and the low progression ratios to higher levels of the educational system. This is reflected in the way in which the family perceived education quality in relation to its own context; which is often regarded in terms of the expectations of children, the perceived relevance of the education the
children are receiving, and their ability to meet parental aspirations. Family and community expectations of education quality affect decision making around access to school and learners’ retention.

Abadha (2015) raised a great concern on unsatisfactory performance and achievement of girls in public primary schools in Rift Valley Province. The survey carried out in KCPE results in Kenya revealed that girls perform poorly in almost all subjects compared to boys. This becomes even worse as they move up the ladder. This is also supported by Fatuma and Sifuna (2016). The fact the curriculum fails to adequately address the needs of girls who acts the role of mothers and are mostly absent from school is a great concern. This makes them also suffer from chronic fatigue, lack of concentration and forced repetition. Their academic performance is hence impaired and selfimage lowered and eventually these girls drop out of school (UNESCO, 2011).

Moreover, with the advent of subsidized secondary education, enrolment increased in the classes and the learners arrived with wide ranging levels of preparedness. These large and heterogeneous classes can challenge pedagogy. For example, at the beginning of 2015 the average form one class in some areas of Western region was 83 students and in 28% of the classes it was more than 100 (Glennester et al, 2015).

The issue of quality of education, which has to do with the process and practices, is another factor that affect school dropout. According to Akyeampong (2017) and Hunt (2018), the level of school performance, its institutional configuration,
its processes and practices and relationship within the school, between teachers and students, all influence access and completion. These factors within the school have been found to interact with other factors outside the school to cause learners to dropout, although in some cases, a single positive or negative experience at school can be the main determinant of whether a student stays in school or withdraws (Boyle et al., 2012; State of World’s Children, 2016; Save the Children, 2015; Uwezo Kenya, 2010).

Real and perceived educational quality has been raised by many researchers as a major factor influencing schooling access (Mukudi, 2014; Republic of Kenya, 2015). Improved access to education as a result of EFA and UPE programmes has highlighted the importance of quality as a requirement for ensuring sustained access. It has been argued that quality has been compromised by rapid expansion and increased access (Boyle et al, 2012).

A recent national wide survey in Kenya found that only 33% of students in form 2 can pass form one exam (Uwezo Kenya, 2010). These poor performance and learning indicators may conspire to push students out of school. Banarjee and Duflo (2016) state that there are varying definitions of what quality actually means. There seems to be a death of empirical studies establishing the link between quality of education and school dropout. Such shortcoming notwithstanding, the discussion on education facilities are linked to quality in terms of human resources and in-school resources.

In the view point of Brock & Cammish (2017), availability of resources such as textbooks, desks and blackboards has been found to influence school dropout.
Teaching practice and behaviour can particularly influence a pupil’s decision to dropout. The prevalence of teacher absenteeism is noted in the works of Alcazar et al (2011) and Banarjee and Duflo (2016) and the global teacher absence project, reports cases of public primary school teacher absence (Chaudhury et al 2015). Although much is still unknown about how teacher absence leads to dropout, it clearly implies that students’ education and by extension, interest in school suffers as a result.

Another body of research findings had been concerned with school practices and processes and how they impact on school dropout. This category of research report shows that teacher attitudes towards students impact on whether they dropout or not. In the same vain, from their research in Ethiopia and Guinea, Colclough et al (2000) found that teachers were more positive about perception, interest and intelligence of boys rather than girls. In some cases, this is because they believe that girls will drop out early, an attitude that can then become a self- prophecy (UNESCO, 2010).

In their study in Guinea, Glick and Sahn (2011) argue that school environment and classroom circumstances in general seem to be less conducive to effective learning for girls than boys. Rather surprising, in other contexts, educational practices have been found to be more likely to exclude boys (Hunter & May, 2013). Although few researchers make the direct link, there are issues related to the preservation of an appropriate teacher-student relationship and dropout. For example, the use of corporal punishment or violence is
practised by teachers in many countries (Humphreys, 2016; Hunt, 2018), in which boys are mostly targeted leading them to dropout.

There are policy initiatives that have been established geared towards the improvement and access of education in Kenya. These have been introduced under Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment (ERSWE) 2003-2007. Key reforms include the development of Sessional Paper No.1 which resulted in the adoption of a Sector Wide Approach Programme Planning (SWAP) to the provision of education in the country. This approach involves different stakeholders to support education both at the primary and secondary level of education.

Through the SWAP process, the government and development partners have developed the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP), the programme aimed to improve access, equity, quality, retention and completion rates both at primary and secondary school level of education (MOEST, 2015). On operationalization of KESSP in 2005, key developments have been introduced within the education sector. At primary level, these reforms involve the decentralization of functions from the national to institutional levels, a move that is aimed at bringing services closer to the people and tackle education wastages like drop out.

The government then introduced a policy on “participant and support” which is cost-sharing and it stipulated that the government would encourage those who participated in services provided by the government to finance the
recurrent costs of those activities. This meant that parents with children in schools were encouraged to help in meeting the cost of educating their children (MOEST, 2015). Policies were then formulated in line with the World Bank Policy Studies on Education in 1988. One recommendation of this paper was cost-sharing. Following this was the Sessional Paper No. 6 of 1988 which placed the responsibility of the provision and maintenance of physical facilities and equipment firmly on parents’ shoulders (MOEST, 2015).

In the cost-sharing strategy, the government finances educational administration and professional services while communities, parents and sponsors provide physical facilities, books and supplementary readers, stationery and other consumables. This led to the abolition of the School Equipment Scheme in 1989. Through cost-sharing, schools have been able to raise finances where the communities have shared costs with the government in provision of a variety of basic human services like education.

Good management practices lead to satisfactory and equitable allocation of teaching learning resources that are required in school to be utilized by teachers and learners which will result to better performance in KCSE exams. Poor management practices lead to inadequate teaching learning resources that are required in school. This in turn affects teaching and learning which in the long run affects the KCSE performance. The study thus sought to find out how secondary schools go about mobilizing and allocating resources among competing subject needs.
Neild 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 and Tonui (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 Mukundi (2014), 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.

2.4 Principals Leadership Style on Drop-Out

According to Sushila (2017), the head is the pioneer in an institution, personnel who numerous parts of the institution rotate, and the individual accountable for everything about the running of the institutions, be it scholastic or managerial. Ayot (2017), states that the organization and running of school can contribute to how students fail and dropout in institutions. If a school is poorly managed the teachers, students and subordinate staff tend not to enjoy what they are doing, this
can create laziness among teachers, students and subordinate staff. The material components of a school are the students, teachers' books, equipment and the buildings and these must harmonize.

Eshiwani (2018) noted that the task of coordinating them is the responsibility of the principal and it requires much skill if he is to do the job well. When principals run their institutions well they avoid unnecessary transfers of teachers due to personal interest, students perform well in examinations because they are motivated due to confidence they have in school and teachers. Teachers avoid absenteeism both in class and in school, teaching equipment are available, students obey teachers and subordinate staff and there is no misuse of public funds and school properties. This ensures that students are retained in school since they are motivated by their performance (Ayot, 2017).

The principal who is the supervisor in a school should have clear knowledge of the processes and methods of passing and acquiring knowledge so that he can be of help to the teachers. Mullins (2017) observes that this practical and theoretical knowledge also with the varied experience will enable him to command respect and help the teachers. This will also help ensure that standards of working are maintained and people are working as per expected studies and educational goals are being achieved (Fine, 2018).

When schools institute the right principles, it helps fosters a learning environment that improves the academic and social success of the students in the schools, especially those with disabilities (Gill & Reynolds, 2017). The student’s behavior indicates that the schools are learning institutions which can be expanded to
provide the intended results. Collaboration should be part of the school practices where the learners are made part of academic programs in a bid to ensure they stay in schools. School heads that recognize that they have a responsibility to the students in their schools and also provide clear instructions to their members of staff improve the success of the institution and also the performance of the students while motivating them to complete their studies (Lip sky & Gartner, 2017).

Michubu (2016) did an examination to research the variables impacting enlistment and finish rates in open optional institutions in Meru. Proof starting from the earliest stage instances of no enrollment of understudies in form one and non-fulfillment in form four. This in this manner converts into some level of instruction wastefulness. Differences in principal can also be a reason behind differing completion rates of learners in schools.

Principals are not the same as they use varying methods to handle situations in their schools. According to a study done by Kamalludeen (2016) on past experience of school heads, it was observed those school heads that have ample experience as principals or deputy principals are in a better position to amicably solve issues arising in their institutions and to improve the performance of their schools while ensuring the completion among students is high.

According to Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2018) these educational institutions basically have instructional leadership which serves to achieve educational objectives and high teacher expectations for learners. Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2018) further performed an analysis in which examined 22 of the 27 studies which
was involved in the comparison of transformational and instructional leadership on learners’ academic achievement. Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2018) found out that on average, instructional leadership on learners’ academic achievement was three to four times that of transformational leadership.

The above reviewed study fetched data from 22 out of 27 published studies in New Zealand whereas the current study was conducted among 3 principals of the involved schools, 43 teachers and 1040 students in Kikuyu Sub-County, Kiambu County. The above study dwelt on leadership style against student academic outcomes while the current study investigated leadership styles against student dropout rates in schools.

According to Messick and Kramer (2014) the level or amount of leadership qualities that a person is able to show greatly relies on his personal traits and the existing situation within which he is supposed to exercise his leadership qualities. Because humankind have the potential to join certain organizations so as to attain certain goal, the ability of them to get more involved and committed depends on how they are able to see their usefulness in being in the particular organization or firm. Hence a person is more likely to favor an organization that meets his/her goals or objective. The type of leadership exhibited by leaders in an organization is the most important factor in determining how successful the organization will be.

In addition, a study by Don (2016) asserts that learning institutions are held responsible for the outcomes of their performance thus a lot of them see it fit to widen the leadership structure so as to provide more room for better management
and improved performance. Don (2016) argued that many leaders working in conjunction with each other will do great things for the schools hence improve the academic performance. The above reviewed study was done in Colombia among 195 high school principals and superintendents whereas the current study is done among 3 secondary schools involving the 3 principals of the involved schools, 43 teachers and 1040 students in Kikuyu Sub-County, Kiambu County. The above study employed the use of questionnaires as data collecting tools where emerging themes were gathered and analyzed. Data was analyzed using mean subscale scores, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients, independent sample t-tests, Pearson correlations, percentages and frequencies. The current study used percentages and mean in data analysis.

According to Lee and Chuang (2019) a good leader not only promotes those below him to bring about efficiency but goes ahead to provide what is needed to attain the targets for the organization that have been set up. Fry (2013) argues that the kind of leadership applied has the potential to influence the behavior of employee and thus their level of motivation. The type of leadership put in place should be directly related to the level of performance seen in a firm. Current changing markets put in place new forms of competition thus creating forms of diversification that would greatly affect performance of firms (Santora et al., 2013).

The impact of leadership should be well understood because research has termed leadership style to be the main contributor of organization performance in the current market. Transactional leadership enables firms to attain their put in place goals better by making sure that the employee are able to work with the existing
resources thus improving firm performance (Zhu, Chew and Spengler, 2015). Visionary leaders come up with a specific vision for the company and outline it to those involved. They then strategize on how to make the vision a reality (McShane & Von Glinow, 2015). This kind of leadership promotes greater amounts of cohesion, commitment, trust, motivation, and hence performance in the new organizational environments.

The kind of leadership exhibited in a firm has the ability to strongly customer satisfaction, staff satisfaction together with improved performance. A lot of comprehensive research has not been to analyze how the different leadership styles are practiced within the schools and how they influence dropout rates. Different researchers have also argued that leaders and the type of leadership style they exhibit significantly influences those below them (Solomon, Fernald and Tarabishy, 2015).

According to Abwalla (2014), the study revealed that the type of leadership style that the principal had in secondary schools in Gambella region affected the ability of the teachers to make decisions and the dropout rate of the learners in the school. The above reviewed study was conducted among 170 teacher and 20 general secondary school principals in Ethiopia whereas the current study used the 3 principals of the involved schools, 43 teachers and 1040 students in Kikuyu Sub-County, Kiambu County. The above study employed the used of questionnaire and interviews as the main instruments of data collection which is similar to the current study.
The literature on school leadership heavily emphasizes the head teacher’s role in establishing and maintaining a positive school culture that promotes learning and engagement for students and adults (Goldring et al., 2016; Habegger, 2018). A positive culture is aligned to goals and objectives consistent with the mission and vision of the school (Zepeda, 2017). Indeed, according to Hall (2016), effective head teachers are those who have high expectations for students, as this belief about students’ ability to learn is critical to school improvement. High achieving schools are marked by a culture that empower and instill confidence in teaching, valued their students' and teachers, and sought the help of parents and community members to enhance the schools’ effectiveness, this creates a sense of belonging and providing a clear direction for all involved (Habegger, 2018).

Kitavi (2014) research found out that there was a strong relationship between leadership styles and learners dropout rates. In other words, dropout rates in the schools was explained by the prevailing style of leadership. It is apparent that leadership plays a very critical role in galvanizing all the other factors in the school together. Nsubuga (2013) research in Uganda established that there was a strong relationship between leadership styles and school dropout rates in secondary schools in Uganda. In other words, learners dropout rate in secondary schools was explained by the prevailing style of leadership.

According to Mullins (2012), autocratic leaders create a situation where subordinates who do not want to realize the importance of work are
forcefully led to work. Autocratic leaders supervise subordinates very closely to ensure compliance and the completion of work in the designated time. Leadership is meant to be effective even where the situation seems harsh so as to drive organizational intentions towards goal achievement.

Research findings by Kasule (2013), on the influence of leadership styles on student dropout rate in private primary schools in the Wakiso district, Uganda indicate that autocratic leaders usually emphasize authority as a means of having the work done. School managers generally emphasize it, since it reaps results very quickly, as subordinates work under pressure to meet deadlines. A study by Miller (2012), however, noted that school managers, who use authority to get things done, are too strict in the formality by which things are done. This hinders teacher creativity especially in instances where creativity and planning are imperative to anchor the student retention in schools.

Okumbe (2015) opines that decentralization of authority participatory planning and mutual communication are some of the main features of democratic leadership. However, as Oyetunyi (2016) points out, the major point of focus is sharing; the manager shares decision-making with the subordinates. Even though he/she invites contributions from the subordinates before making a decision, he/she retains the final authority to make decisions (consultative). The manager may also seek discussion and agreement with teachers over an issue before a decision is taken (consensus). He/she may allow the subordinates to take a vote on an issue before a decision is taken (democratic). He/she coaches
subordinates and negotiates their demands (Burns, 2008). This type of leadership is viewed as an important aspect of empowerment, teamwork and collaboration.

It has been observed that a school is more effective when those who are affected by the organization’s decisions are fully involved in the decision-making process. The concern expressed by Burns is that the participative style of leadership wastes time due to endless meetings and may lead to confusion and lack of direction. By implication, it is not appropriate for use in times of crisis when the situation demands on-the-spot decision (Ackers, 2016). However, unlike the laissez-faire style, the leader adopting this style maintains the final decision making authority. Using this style is not a sign of weakness; rather it is a sign of strength that one respects the employees’ ways of doing things. Using this style is of mutual benefit as it allows staff to become part of the team and allows one to make better decisions.

Kennelly (2017) argues that effective democratic and participatory school administration; leadership and management affect the trust levels of stakeholders. The study focuses on a survey of the effectiveness of democratic and participatory school administration and management in one school division in the Philippines. Indicators of participatory school administration, leadership and management effectiveness are correlated with the stakeholders’ level of trust. The study suggested that school leaders wishing to enhance the levels of trust among the stakeholders in their schools should consider these indicators, pertaining to the participatory or democratic leadership approach, in carrying out their leadership duties and responsibilities.
As pointed out by Kouznes and Posner (2013), school managers know that no one does his/her best when feeling weak, incompetent or alienated; they know that those who are expected to produce the results must feel a sense of ownership. In order for a school to provide quality education, those who have been empowered to lead the transformation of the schools to address the challenges of the new millennium should carefully nurture democratic leadership. Democratic leadership can be effectively utilized to extract the best from people and the most effective and efficient educational climate can be created in a school when democracy is employed (Ndani, 2014).

The democratic leadership practices in secondary schools outline procedures to develop and use the potential of all the stakeholders of a school in order to create and foster quality education. The principles of democratic leadership are flexibly applied in order to create a climate in which all stakeholders are able to express themselves freely and hence feel that they are part of the democratic decision-making process. Stakeholders need to feel that they are able to have an influence over what should happen and not happen at the school rather than to be subjected to the decisions of those placed in positions of hierarchical power (Mukundi, 2014). This type of leadership may influence student retention positively hence reducing student dropout rates in schools.

The situational theory of leadership by Chandan (2014) presupposes that an analysis of leadership not only involves the individual traits and behavioral approaches to leadership, but also focuses on the situation. The focus is often on the situation and not the leader. According to Mazzarelia and
Smith (2011), different kinds of situations demand different characteristics and behaviors, because each type of leader faces different situations. The school manager is required to size up the situation and choose the appropriate leadership style that will be effective for a situation, rather than try to manipulate situations to fit a particular leadership style.

According to Oyetunyi (2016) leadership in schools is a situational phenomenon as it is based on the collective perception of people working in the schools, linked to the norms and is affected by the rate of interaction among members of the school, a successful school manager under one set of circumstances may be unsuccessful and/or a failure in another. Colclough (2013) asserts that leadership is the leader’s ability to handle a given situation and is based upon the leader’s skill in that particular area that is pertinent to the situation. The person most likely to act as a leader is the one who is most competent for the situation of a given group as the case may be, the nature of the situation dictates the style of leadership, because leadership success is dependent on the ability of a leader to fit in the prevailing situation.

2.5 Students’ Discrimination by Teachers Influence Drop-Out

The subject of gender discrimination has been a point of concern for many global institutions. When this kind of discrimination happens in secondary schools the students are greatly affected as at their age they are starting to discover and understand themselves and the role they play in the community (Dobson, 2016). Further, the scholar points out that when the learner is discriminated based on gender, they are treated unfairly based on the students’ sex. If the student was a
boy, he was treated less favorably than the girl and vice versa. When boys are discriminated in regard to discipline cases, there is a higher likelihood of them dropping out from school (Francis, 2018).

Blackmore and Cooksey (2016) pointed out that an admission to a secondary school is followed by some enrollment procedures. The subject is informed that they are to listen to their teachers and follow their commands. According to Fatuma and Sifuna (2016) in the African context girls were often socialized to make good wives, dependents, homemakers and secretaries. On the other hand, boys were taught to be pilots, defenders, breadwinners and proper husbands. These practices also affect the gender treatment in educational institutions.

A survey conducted by Brigeon (2017) which looked at ways to make schools in the rift valley region safe found that girls and their families may find it useless to take their girls to schools in cases where women are likely to get lowly paid occupation which are believed to be fit for women. Further, the study pointed out that many learning institutions in developing countries practice gender discrimination and discourages girls from pursuing science and educational courses. During teaching, teachers often give more opportunities to boys to ask more questions, lead groups and use the learning resources which often discourage girls in being active participants of learning.

A research done by Mwandosya (2017) on girls education in Kenya and Tanzania showed that more than 2000 teachers observed had separate rows for girls and boys and boys were asked male related questions more than girls in the classes. Teacher
gender discrimination was looked into by the researcher. The performance of girls in these schools was negatively affected by gender discrimination attitudes among teachers, students and parents. Some of the roles given to girls in schools that indicate gender discrimination include preparing tea and lunch for the teachers, fetching water and washing utensils for the teachers (Eshiwani, 2018).

Sax, (2017) also pointed out that girls waste a lot of time away from learning when they are sent to take books to their teachers offices which is a factor that contributes to sexual harassment. Such roles require the girls to sacrifice some time from learning which negatively affects the performance of the girls in their exams. This also contributes to the dropping out of school by the girls. Mudulia and Kipsoi (2017) pointed out that the performance of girls in the Kenyan education system was nit satisfactorily. The study that surveyed K.C.SE results revealed that boys perform better in all subjects compared to girls. The performance among girls gets worse as they continue with their education.

Fatuma and Sifuna (2016) agreed with these sentiments. It was noted that the school curriculum fails to address the plight of girls who are mothers who need some time away from school to look after their children. This contributes to the girls feeling tired, poor concentration and poor performance leading to forced repetition in their classes. Further, due to their poor performance, their self-esteemed is negatively affected which can lead to them drooping out early from school (UNESCO, 2018). The study therefore confirmed whether the drop out of students is related to discrimination by teachers.
Teachers’ discrimination towards their students have a great impact on the academic achievement and the retention in school of their pupils. Few classroom observations in Kenya indicate that there are cases where teachers’ negative attitudes push some students out of school. These students are sometimes neglected, abused, mis-handled, and sent out of class during teaching learning periods. This atmosphere is not conducive to learning and makes some students hate school. An obvious result of all this are absenteeism, poor performance, and non-completion of the education cycle.

2.6 Summary of Literature Review

The analysis of empirical studies demonstrates that when resources are not provided in their adequacy in institutions, learning will not take place hence dropout among students. Other studies have shown that policies can lead to expulsions, forced transfers and suspensions. The reviewed literature has also shown that the organization and running of school can add to how learners fail and withdraw from institutions. As reviewed in the literature, discrimination either by gender or by teacher’s preference to some students over others may lead to school drop-out. The above reviewed studies have either adopted diverse methodologies, conducted in different geographical backgrounds or have been based on either the boy child or the girl child leaving research gaps. This research hopes to fill the existing gaps by assessing school based dynamics prompting learners withdrawal from public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.
The problem of school dropout cannot be attributed to one single factor. The literature review has highlighted the major determinants of dropouts. The factors discussed include: school based factors, economic factors, socio-cultural factors, school environment and gender related factors. These factors are closely interrelated and all have a role to play in the dropout phenomenon. Any attempts to alleviate this problem must therefore take the factors and deal with each factor in a systematic manner. Research has been reviewed on school based factors on learners dropout, however, these studies were done in different environments in the world. There are limited studies conducted on this subject area in Kenya and specifically in Kiambu County and this study aims at filling this gap.

Literature has been reviewed on leadership styles, students’ discrimination and school policies and characteristics in developed countries as well as in Sub-Saharan Africa. Few studies had been done in this area in Kiambu County. Therefore, the above among other research gaps identified in this review necessitated an in-depth study to identify the school based factors influencing students’ dropout in public schools in Kikuyu sub-county Kiambu county.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This part covers the research organization that was embraced for the exploration. The chapter presents the exploration design, study location, target population, sample and sampling approaches, exploration tools, pilot study, data gathering procedure, data analysis and presentation and ethical concerns.

3.2 Research Design

A descriptive survey design was embraced in conducting the study. This research design uses information that gives a description of the existing subject matter by asking participants about their attitudes, perceptions, values and behaviors towards the phenomenon under study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2012). This design was used for this research due to the large population under study and because it was difficult to observe each respondent individually.

The design allows for the use of questionnaires or interview questions to draw reliable data from the population under study (Orodho, 2017). The researcher chose to use this design since it allowed for the gathering and analysis of data from the respondents without being biased or manipulating the research variables (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2012). The researcher successfully collected facts for the purposes replying queries regarding the existing standing of the themes of the exploration and assess the opinions and attitudes of procedures, events and individuals related to the study (Gay, 2018).
3.3 Study Location

The exploration was executed in Kikuyu sub-county, Kiambu County. The location is selected since Kiambu County has been experiencing learners withdrawal in secondary institutions particularly in Kikuyu sub-county according to the sub-county education office.

3.4 Target Population

The target population consisted of 28 principals and 427 teachers and 10400 learners of public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County (Kikuyu Education Office, 2017). These were targeted since they were assumed to be informed on the school based factors influencing school drop-out in the location.

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques

3.5.1 Sampling

To determine the sample size the researcher adapted the recommendation of 10 to 30% of the universe which is seen as representative and can be generalized to the population Mugenda & Mugenda (2012). The researcher used the lower limit of 10% of the population. The sample therefore comprised of the three principals of the sampled institutions which is 10 percent of the 28 institutions, 43 teachers which is 10 percent of the total population of 427 teachers and 1040 students which is 10% of the total population of 10400 students.

3.5.2 Sampling Techniques

Stratified sampling identified the sample institutions since it was best suited to ensure inclusion of all population subgroups. The institutions were grouped into
three strata depending on whether they are day or boarding institutions, that is, mixed day institutions and girl’s boarding institutions or boy’s boarding institutions. Proportional allocation of teachers and principals using 10 percent per school category was used to select students, teachers and principals from each secondary school in the area. Proportional allocation of the respondents was done to ensure that equal number of the respondents was drawn from each school as opined by Waksberg (2008). This also enabled an equal representation among the schools sampled.

In selecting of principals from each category, the researcher wrote down all the names of the institutions in each school category on pieces of paper and randomly selected three principals one from mixed institutions, one from girls boarding and one from boys boarding. In selecting the teachers the researcher wrote small pieces of papers bearing ‘‘Yes’’ equal to the required sample size and ‘‘No’’ for other teachers. The papers were then folded and placed in a bowl. Then each teacher was kindly requested to randomly pick one paper. Those with ‘‘YES’’ papers made the sample for the study. This method was best suited to reduce selection biasness.

In selecting the students, the study selected more students from the form three and form four classes. This was informed by the fact that form three and form four students have spent more time in the school than the form one and form two students and thus are more informed about the school factors that had an influence on students dropout. The selection was proportionate and random selection was used in picking the respondents.
3.6 Research Instruments

Raw data was collected from the participants with the help of pre-determined questionnaires and interviews. Both open and closed queries helped in the collection of raw data as Creswell (2019) explains, data collection methods used for collection of raw data include semi-structured and structured questionnaires, structured and semi-structured interviews.

3.6.1 Questionnaire for Students

The study used questionnaires that had open ended, closed-ended, and dichotomous questions for the students. Likert scale questions were used since they are appropriate; abide by the principles of validity, reliability and consideration. The questionnaires were embraced to obtain data from scholars since questionnaires are often used when many respondents who are willing to provide relevant data are to be sought (Bernard & Bernard, 2013). The research tool helped collect both qualitative and quantitative data from the students on school based attributes persuading learners’ drop out in public secondary institutions.

3.6.2 Interview guide for Principals and Teachers

Interview guides were used for both the teacher and the principals since the target population is small. The teachers and the principals were interviewed since they are in a position to give an in-depth response regarding student drop-out as well (Bernard & Bernard, 2013). The interviews collected qualitative data on school based features that influence learners’ dropout in public secondary institutions.
3.7 Pilot Study

Before the main study was done, a pre-test was done with a hundred (100) students who were not the same as the main respondents in the study to discourage bias in the research. The 100 respondents were students from a secondary school in the neighboring Limuru sub-county. This represents 5% of the sample size. According to Render et al., (2012), a pretest ranges from 1-10% of the sample population. This helped improve the research tool, improve its readability and reduce misinterpretation ((Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2011).

3.7.1 Validity

Content validity was guaranteed by ensuring all the objective questions were included in the research tool. The supervisors’ expertise was also sought and their input included in the research tool. The pilot test helped to do away with inappropriate questions in the research instrument. The data from the pre-test was analysed and the findings helped improve the tool before it could be used in the main study.

3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability was guaranteed since the instrument was part of the pre-test conducted. Students used as sample in the questionnaire had similar characteristics with those used in the main study which helped reduce bias in the results obtained. To check the results reliability, Cronbach’s alpha test was utilised to enhance internal consistency. Cronbach’s alpha quantifies the correlation of the average measurable elements. SPSS software helped in the verification of the reliability of the collected data. Cronbach's alpha further helped in the testing of the overall reliability of the
present and desirable situation. The expected level of reliability from this test was 0.70 (Cooper & Schindler, 2006).

### 3.8 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher visited the targeted institutions and sought permission from the school managements and seeking the right time to collect the data. With the help of research assistants, self-administered questionnaires helped collect raw data from the sample. The researcher dropped and later picked the research tool from the students after they had filled it. A letter of introduction was issued to the respondents explaining the aim of the exploration.

With the interview guides, the researcher personally visited the institutions and interviewed the selected teachers and principals in the respective institutions. Call back method was used where if the principal who was not available at the day of day collection, the researcher went back at a later date collect the data.

### 3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation

The quantitative data was coded and later keyed in into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 20). The data was later analyzed using descriptive statistics namely; percentages and frequencies, mean and standard deviation. The findings obtained were presented in graphs, pie charts and bar charts. These presentation methods were used as they were easy to interpret and understand for the users (Orodho, 2017). Qualitative data was analysed thematically. This was done by first categorizing and discussing responses for each item according to themes. The data was edited, coded and reported using descriptive narrative of the
views, experiences and opinions of the respondents. Content analysis was used for qualitative data analysis and presentation was done in prose form.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

To execute the exploration, an approval was first sought from Kenyatta University graduate school. Secondly a research authorization was obtained from National commission for science technology and innovation (NACOSTI). Further authorizations were obtained from authorities of the county particular the education administrators and school administrators of the specified institutions.

Assurance was made to the participants on the main aim of the exploration which was for academic aim only. It was made clear to the participants that the involvement was on voluntary basis and if any of them wished to withdraw their participation then they were allowed to do so at any time or stage of the process of gathering data. It was also made clear that there would be no monetary reward for their involvement. Chances were offered for any queries regarding the study or the process prior to consent form signing. Privacy was ascertained by eliminating any means through which the data provided would be associated to any specific respondent.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION
AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

At this stage the findings and discussions on the evaluation are presented. The presentation was centered on the exploration intentions. The study aimed to evaluate institution based factors influencing students’ dropout rate in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Demographic information of the students involved in the study is also presented. The objectives were;

i) To establish the influence of school resources on students’ dropout rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

ii) To assess the influence of School policies and practices on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iii) To determine the influence of principal’s leadership style on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iv) To establish the extent to which students’ discrimination by teachers influence students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.
4.1.1 Return Rate

The table below presents the study’s rate of return.

Table 4.1: Return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return rate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaires</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Questionnaires</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Interviews</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 1040 sampled students, 803 completed the questionnaires which is a response rate of 77.2%. All three sampled principals and the 43 teachers were interviewed. The response rate was regarded as satisfactory. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) instrument response rate of 70% and above is deemed as excellent.

4.2 Demographic Information

The first section of the questionnaire sought the demographic information of the students whose findings are presented in this section. This was information on gender, class and age of the students.

4.2.1 Gender

Demographic information on gender was obtained from the questionnaires filled by the students as shown in figure 4.1.
The data analysis as shown in figure 4.1 show that 54% of the students were female and 46% were male. This implies that there were more female than male in the schools in Kikuyu sub-county. The findings also confirm that both gender were involved in the study thus the findings with regard to students dropout takes into account of the male and female leaners.

### 4.2.2 Students’ class

The study sought to determine the distribution of the students by class. This was important to a confirmation that the students were not drawn from one class which would lead to biasness. The students indicated their respective classes as presented in figure 4.2.
From the analysis as shown in figure 4.2, most of the students (35.9%) were in form 3, 33% were in form 2, 24.9% were in form 4 and 6.3% were in form 1. The implication was that there are more form 2 students compared to those in form 3. This may be attributed to dropout of the form 3 students or low enrolment at the time of joining secondary education.

4.2.3 Students’ age

The study sought to establish the age distribution of the students. Data on students’ age was obtained through the uses of the questionnaires as indicated in figure 4.3

![Figure 4.3: Students age](image)

From the findings, 39.6% were between 15-16 years, 38.4% were 17-18 years, 16.9% were 19 years and above while only 5.1% were 14 years and below. The indication is that majority of the students were between 15 to 18 years.

4.3 Influence of School Resources on Drop-Out

The first objective was to disclose the influence of institution resources on drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Questionnaire helped collect
raw data for this objective from the students and the interview was used to gather facts from the teachers and principals about the influence of school resources on students’ drop-out.

Students were requested to rate the subsequent attributes on the influence of school resources on students drop-out rate on a scale where 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented undecided or neutral, 4 represented agree and 5 represented strongly agree. Their responses are presented in Table 4.2 where the frequencies, percentages mean and standard deviations of the responses are presented.

Table 4.2 : Influence of School Resources on Drop-out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating student/teacher ratios</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited learning facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few non-teaching staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate/poor sanitary and toilet facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 show that majority of the learners (62.3%) were in agreement with the view that schools with adequate resources reduces the dropout rates of the learners as supported by a mean of 4.30, schools with limited learning facilities discourage students from attending such schools as indicated by 56.8% and supported by a mean of 4.18, students in schools with few non-teaching staff easily drop out due to the extra duties that they are given in the school as indicated by 61.3% of the learners and supported by a mean of 4.09.

The findings show that deteriorating student/teacher ratios are part of the problems relating to the accomplishment of quality secondary education prompting lower scholastic and culmination rates among learners as indicated by 54.7% of the learners and supported by a mean of 3.98 and that inadequate and poor sanitary and toilet facilities affect retention of students in schools as indicated by 53.2% of the learners and supported by a mean of 3.85. This study is consistent with that of Thomas, (2017) who established that declining student/teacher ratios continue to present encounters on the accomplishment of quality secondary education prompting lower scholastic and culmination rates among learners. Similar to the study findings, Okemwa, 2018) revealed that inadequate and poor quality of sanitary facilities in the schools are a health hazard and also discourage girl students from attending schools. In some instances, the loss of dignity and privacy to these girls due to such facilities prompt them to drop out of schools.

On how else school resources influence students drop-out, the students stated that school facilities make learning smooth and enjoyable. Lack of resources transfers the burden to the parents who are then required to chip in and provide some of the
resources. Due to poverty levels parents may be unable to provide the required resources which results in school dropout.

From the interviews, the study wanted to deduce if there are enough resources in the schools. The teachers stated that passing and acquiring knowledge resources were not enough in the schools. The and principals stated that lack of adequate resources in the institutions influence drop out. It makes passing and acquiring knowledge difficult and also passes some cost to the parents who are not always in a position to provide some of the requirements. This leads to drop out in the long run for some students.

Consistently, in a study by Mwikali (2015) on the assessment of the determinants of secondary school dropout rate in Gilgil it was found that the determinants of secondary school dropout rate were lack of adequate school resources. The essential school resources that lacked in the schools included clean toilets, and adequate classrooms similar to the study findings. The findings also concur to that of McNeal (2014) who established that larger student-teacher ratios may increase a student’s likelihood of dropping out by decreasing the number of interactions between learners and teachers.


The subsequent objective was to institute the influence of institutional policies and practices on learners’ withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Questionnaire were utilized to obtain raw data for this objective from the students and the interview was used to gather statistics from the teachers and principals on the impact of school practices and policies on students’ drop-out.
Students were requested to rate the subsequent attributes on the influence of school policies and practices on students drop-out rate on a scale where 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented undecided or neutral, 4 represented agree and 5 represented strongly agree. Their responses are presented in Table 4.3 where the frequencies, percentages mean and standard deviations of the responses are presented.

Table 4.3: Influence of School Policies and Practices on Drop-Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsh School policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td>(57.4%)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student view on fair discipline policies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
<td>(12.6%)</td>
<td>(50.2%)</td>
<td>(29.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on students’ performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(6.8%)</td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
<td>(50.2%)</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices that inform the students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>(52.4%)</td>
<td>(31.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies that discriminate some students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(51.2%)</td>
<td>(41.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that majority of the students (51.2%) agreed on the statements that school policies that discriminate some students may lead to drop out of the discriminated students as shown by a mean of 4.31, 52.4% of the learners agreed that school practices that inform the students on the need of education encourage...
students to complete the school course. This is supported by a mean of 4.07. Majority of the learners (50.2%) agreed that student view on fair discipline is a prediction of the dropout rates of the students which is supported by a mean of 3.98.

The students (50.2%) also agreed that schools’ policies on students’ performance influence the student’s school attendance as shown by a mean of 3.91 and that harsh school policies affect students’ turnover directly and result to the involuntarily leaving of school by students as indicated by 75.4% and supported by a mean 3.82. Similarly, Rumberger and Thomas, (2018) established that the perceptions of learners when it came to fair discipline practices are a good prediction of the learning institutions dropout rates. The students further stated that students involuntarily withdraw from school because of expulsion, suspensions and strict rules related to misbehavior, non-attendance or poor grades.

From the interviews the principals stated that school policies and practices in the school influence drop-out. The principals explained in cases of misbehaving, the school policies may require that such undisciplined students be expelled from the school. The teachers stated that school policies and practices influence withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County to a small extent. Consistent findings were revealed by Gaias and Bradshaw (2018) who found that student withdrawal is affected by general policies and practices provided in a bid to improve the effectiveness of the educational institutions.
4.5 Influence of Principal’s Leadership Style on Drop-Out

The third objective was to institute the influence of principal’s leadership style on learners’ drop-out in secondary institution in Kikuyu Sub-County. Questionnaire helped get data for this objective from the students and the interview was used to gather facts from the teachers and principals on the influence of styles adopted by the heads on learners’ withdrawal from the institutions.

Students were requested to rate the subsequent attributes on the influence of styles of leading used by principal’s on learners’ drop-out on a scale where 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented undecided or neutral, 4 represented agree and 5 represented strongly agree. Their responses are presented in Table 4.4 where the frequencies, percentages mean and standard deviations of the responses are presented.

Table 4.4: Influence of Principal’s Leadership Style on Students’ Drop-out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Running of school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
<td>(55.3%)</td>
<td>(41.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School heads responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
<td>(50.9%)</td>
<td>(40.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as school heads or deputy principals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in the leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(51.4%)</td>
<td>(41.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dictatorial school principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td>(56.9%)</td>
<td>(38.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who fear the school Principal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
<td>(6.8%)</td>
<td>(19.4%)</td>
<td>(53.8%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 indicates that majority of learners (55.3%) agreed that the running of school can contribute to how students’ dropout in schools as shown by a mean of 4.35. A dictatorial school principal increases the chances of high drop-out as indicated by 56.9% of the learners and supported by a mean of 4.32. Principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduces the chances of drop-outs as indicated by 51.4% of the learners and supported by a mean of 4.29 and that school heads who recognize that they have a responsibility to play when it comes to the education of their learners improve a successful students' completion as indicated by 50.9% of the learners and shown by a mean of 4.28.

Majority of the students (57%) also agreed that principals with experience in the position either as school heads or deputy principals prevent a high drop-out rates as shown by a mean of 4.22 and that students who fear the school principal have a higher likelihood to drop-out of school due to an indiscipline case no matter the magnitude as indicated by 53.8% and supported by a mean of 3.74. Consistent with the findings, Ayot (2017) opine that the organization and running of school can contribute to how students fail and dropout in schools. The findings were similar to the Eshiwani (2018) who noted that the task of coordinating them is the responsibility of the principal and it requires much skill and when principals run their institutions well they avoid unnecessary transfers of teachers due to personal interest, students perform well in examinations and are motivated to retain in the school because they are inspired due to confidence they have in school and teachers.
The study sought to deduce if the school leadership relate well with the students. From the findings, most of the teachers stated that the school leadership relate well with the students, however, some stated that the relation is not smooth. The principals explained that sometimes the students do not always solve their grievances or complains in the rightful manner due to poor relationship with the leadership. Principals who solve issues amicably reduces the chances of dropout of the learners. Consistently, an exploration by Kamalludeen (2016) observed those school heads that have ample experience as principals or deputy principals are in a better position to amicably solve issues arising in their institutions and to improve the performance of their schools while ensuring the completion among students is high.

The study further revealed from the teachers and Principals responses that the students are involved in the schools decision making. The teachers and the principals stated that there is a student leadership structure which is involved in some of the decision making. Consistent to the study findings, Mullins (2017) observes that principals with practical and theoretical knowledge also with the varied experience will enable him to command respect and help the teachers. This will also help ensure that standards of working are maintained and people are working as per expected studies and educational goals are being achieved. The achievement of the leaners academics retains students in the school.

On the impact of principal’s styles of leadership on drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County, teachers stated that the principal is sometimes
harsh on the students which in some cases the students engage in illegal behaviors in protest. This results to some students being expelled or suspended.

The principals stated that they come up with policies and parameters used to implement the policies. Some the policies developed directly or indirectly direct to some students dropping out of school. Similar to the study findings, Nsubuga (2013) a study by established that there was a strong relationship between leadership styles and school dropout rates in secondary schools in Uganda. In other words, learners dropout rate in secondary schools was explained by the prevailing style of leadership.

4.6 Influence of Students’ Discrimination by Teachers on Drop-Out

The fourth objective was to assess the influence of students’ discrimination by teachers on the learners withdrawal from the institutors. Questionnaire helped collect related data for this objective from the students and the interview was used to gather statistics from the teachers and principals on the influence of students’ discrimination by teachers on students’ drop-out.

The researcher requested the students to rate the following statements on the influence of students’ discrimination by teachers on students’ dropout on a scale where 1 represented strongly disagree, 2 represented disagree, 3 represented undecided or neutral, 4 represented agree and 5 represented strongly agree. Outcomes are described in table 4.5. where the frequencies, percentages mean and standard deviations of the responses are presented.
Table 4.5: Influence of Students’ Discrimination by Teachers on Students’ Drop-out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers favour some students over others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination on the basis of disciplinary policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student who are discriminated are given other roles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student likely to drop out to be away from the teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination against those who perform poorly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Founded on the exploration outcomes, majority of the respondents (59.5%) agreed that student who are discriminated and are given other roles which waste a lot of learning time may perform poorly in their academics which can result to them dropping out from the learning institutions as supported by a mean of 4.29. The respondents agreed that if a student is discriminated in relation to the disciplinary practices, it is possible that they will feel alienated from the learning institution as indicated by 60.9% of the learners and supported by a mean of 4.28.

Majority of the learners (56.7%) agreed that teachers discriminate and hate those who perform poorly and in most cases such students feel stigmatized and end up dropping out of school as shown by a mean of 4.23. The students further agreed that students who are discriminated by the teachers are likely to drop out of school.
to be away from the teacher as indicated by 56.3% of the learners and supported by a mean of 4.16 and that teachers favour some students over others as indicated by 56.3% of the learners and supported by a mean of 3.69. Similarly, Francis (2018) found that some disciplinary practices increase the likelihood of their becoming alienated from school.

From the interviews, the teachers stated that they do not discriminate the students in the schools. The principals stated that students’ discrimination by teachers does not influence withdrawal of learners in secondary institutions in the location. Outcomes were however inconsistent to that of Mwandosya (2017) who found that extent of gender discrimination by teachers hampered the performance of girls which led to drop out. Teachers’ discrimination towards their students have a great impact on the retention in school of their students. Few classroom observations in Kenya indicate that there are cases where teachers’ negative attitudes push some students out of school.

These students are sometimes neglected, abused, mis-handled, and sent out of class during teaching learning periods. This atmosphere is not conducive to learning and makes some students hate school. An obvious result of all this are absenteeism, poor performance, and non-completion of the education cycle. The findings further concur with Dobson, (2016) that when the learner is discriminated based on gender, they are treated unfairly based on the students’ sex. If the student was a boy, he was treated less favorably than the girl and vice versa. When boys are discriminated in regard to discipline cases, there is as higher likelihood of them dropping out from school.
The study sought to find out other reasons that lead to school drop-outs. The Principals and teachers stated several other reasons for school dropout including; indiscipline, the quality of the teacher-student relationship, poor academic performance, pregnancy and parenthood and poverty that’s leads to student dropping out in search of jobs.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This stage outlines summary of exploration results, and the conclusions and recommendations made. It also suggests areas for future research. The study sought to assess school based features influencing learners’ withdrawal in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

The objectives of the study were;

i. To establish the influence of school resources on students’ dropout rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

ii. To assess the influence of School policies and practices on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iii. To determine the influence of principal’s leadership style on students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

iv. To establish the extent to which students’ discrimination by teachers influence students drop-out rate in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County.

Exploration was conducted using descriptive assessment plan. Sample population comprised of the 3 principals which is 10 percent of the 28 schools, 43 teachers which is 10 percent of the total population of 427 teachers and 1040 students which is 10% of the total population of 10400 students. Stratified sampling was used to identify the sample schools.
5.2 Summary of the Findings

In here we get the recap of the study outcomes founded on the goals of the exploration.

5.2.1 Influence of School Resources on Drop-Out

The first objective was to find the impact of school resources on learners withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. The exploration established that passing and acquiring knowledge resources were not enough in the institutions which influence drop out. Schools with adequate resources reduce the chances of students dropping out of school while schools with limited learning facilities discourage students from attending such schools. It makes passing and acquiring knowledge difficult and also passes some cost to the parents who are not always in a position to provide some of the required resources due to poverty levels. The study found that deteriorating student/teacher ratios offer difficulties on the accomplishment of excellence secondary education prompting lower scholastic and culmination rates among understudies. Lack of and poor quality physical resources affect retention of students in schools. Lack of resources transfers the burden to the parents who are then required to chip in and provide some of the resources.

5.2.2 Influence of School Policies and Practices on Drop-Out

The next objective was to document the influence of institutional policies and practices on learners’ drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Exploration discovered that institution policies that discriminate some students may lead to drop out of the discriminated students. School practices that inform the
students on the need of education encourage students to complete the school course.

The perception of the learners when it came to fair discipline practices are a good prediction of school dropout rates. Schools policies on students’ performance influence the student’s school attendance in that harsh school policies affect students’ turnover directly and result to the involuntarily withdrawal of the learners from school. The learners may involuntarily withdraw from school because of forced transfers, expulsion and suspension related to misbehavior, skipping classes and poor academic performance. In cases of misbehaving, the school policies may require that such undisciplined students be expelled from the school.

5.2.3 Influence of Principal’s Leadership Style on Drop-Out

The third objective was to establish the influence of styles of leadership adopted by the institution heads on learners’ drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Running of school can contribute to how students dropout in schools. A dictatorial school principal increases the chances of high drop-out while principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduce the chances of drop-outs. School heads who feel they have a responsibility towards the education of their learners improve a successful students' completion. The study also found that principals with experience either as school heads or deputy principals prevent a high drop-out. Students who fear the school principal have a higher likelihood of dropping from school in the event of being indiscipline no matter the magnitude.
The school heads come up with policies and the parameters to implement the policies. Some students may find the policies harsh and as a result may be forced to drop out. In some cases the principal is sometimes harsh on the students which lead to students engaging in illegal behaviors in protest. This results to some students being expelled or suspended. Sometimes the students do not always solve their grievances or complains in the rightful manner due to poor relationship with the leadership.

5.2.4 Influence of Students’ Discrimination by Teachers on Drop-Out

The fourth objective was to establish the extent to which students’ discrimination by teachers influence drop-out. The study found that student who are discriminated and are given other roles which waste a lot of learning time may end up having poor performance in their academics which can result to them dropping out from school. More so, if a student is discriminated in in relation to disciplinary practices, it may make the learner feel alienated from the institution. Teachers discriminate and hate those who perform poorly and in most cases such students feel stigmatized and end up dropping out of school. The students who are discriminated by the teachers are likely to stop schooling to be away from the teacher.

The study established other reasons that lead to school drop-outs. These included; indiscipline, the quality of the teacher-student relationship, poor academic performance, pregnancy and parenthood and poverty that’s leads to student dropping out in search of jobs.
5.3 Conclusion

Founded on the discoveries, the subsequent conclusions were arrived at centered on the exploration objectives; Exploration concluded that passing and acquiring knowledge resources were not enough in the institutions which negatively influenced drop out. Schools with limited learning facilities discourage students from attending such schools. This makes passing and acquiring knowledge difficult and also passes some cost to the parents who are not always in a position to provide some of the required resources due to poverty.

Use of discriminative school policies lead to drop out of the discriminated students. Schools policies on students’ performance influence the student’s school attendance in that harsh school policies affect students’ turnover directly. The students may involuntarily withdraw from school due to suspensions, expulsions, or forced transfers.

The study further concluded that principal’s leadership style influences the school drop-out rate. The principals come up with practices and set the framework to implement the policies.

Teachers discrimination on students influence students’ drop out. In case teachers discriminate and hate those who perform poorly such students feel stigmatized and may opt to stop schooling.
5.4 Recommendations

The below recommendations were made based on the findings on each objective;

i. There is need for provision of adequate resources to reduce the burden passed to the parents. The ministry of education and the government ought to employ more teachers to improve on the teacher students’ ratio for better academic achievements. This will discourage students drop-out.

ii. The government should ensure that the laid down policies are adhered to. Such policies include the policies on grade repetition and school fees.

iii. The school principals need to listen to the teachers and students grievances and address them to ensure that there is understanding and prevent school unrests that may lead to drop outs.

iv. The school management should adopt strategies to discourage student’s discrimination. Such strategies may include having a platform where students can report such discriminative teachers for scrutiny.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The exploration concentrated on assessment school based dynamics influencing learners’ drop-out in public secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. Subsequent future research are suggested;

i. A comparative study be conducted in other sub-counties and counties to assess school based features influencing learners’ withdrawal in public secondary institutions.

An exploration should be conducted to determine home based elements influencing learners withdrawal in public secondary institutions.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Questionnaire for Students

Introduction

I, Regina Wangeci Kiambati intend to carry out a research entitled- school based factors influencing withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County. This research questionnaire is aimed at assisting me collect data for completion of the named research study. I humbly request you to take some time to fill in the questionnaire. Your responses will be used for research purposes and remain confidential during the study period and thereafter.

Instructions

Kindly tick (√) inside the relevant box to indicate the correct answer where choices are given. Write your answer in the spaces provided where choices are not given.

Section I: Demographic Statistics

1. Please designate your gender?
   Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Current Class?
   Form 1 ( ) Form 2 ( )
   Form 3 ( ) Form 4 ( )

3. What is your age?
   14 years and below ( ) 15-16 years ( )
   17-18 years ( ) 19 and above ( )
Section II: Influence of School Resources on Drop-Out

4. Using the Likert scale provided below rate the following statements on influence of school resources on drop-out. (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating student/teacher ratios present difficulties on the accomplishments of quality secondary education prompting lower scholastic and culmination rates among understudies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools with limited learning facilities discourage students from attending such schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in schools with few non teaching staff easily drop out due to the extra duties that they are given in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools with adequate resources reduces the chances of students dropping out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or lack of proper sanitary and toilet facilities impact negatively on the retention rates of students in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How else do school resources influence students drop-out?.................................

...........................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................
Section III: Influence of School Policies and Practices on Drop-Out

6. Using the Likert scale provided below rate the following statements on the impact of school practices and policies on drop-out (1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsh School policies affect students’ turnover directly and result to involuntary leaving of learners from schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception of learners when it came to fair discipline practices successfully predict the dropout rates among learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools policies on students performance influence the students school attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School practices that inform the students on the need of education encourage students to complete the school course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policies that discriminate some students may lead to drop out of the discriminated students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How else do school policies and practices influence student drop-out?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
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Section IV: Influence Of Principal’s Leadership Style on Drop-Out

8. Using the Likert scale provided below rate the following statements on the impact of principal’s leadership style on students’ drop-out (1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The running of school can contribute to how students dropout in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School heads who accept that they have a responsibility to their learners education improve a successful students' completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals with experience as school heads or deputy principal prevent a high drop-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduces the chances of drop-outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dictatorial school principal increase the chances of high drop-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who fear the school Principal have higher chances of dropping out from schools in the event of an indiscipline case no matter the magnitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How else do principal’s leadership style influence students' drop-out?
Section V: Influence of Students’ Discrimination by Teachers on Drop-Out

10. Using the Likert scale provided below rate the following statements on the influence of students’ discrimination by teachers on students’ drop-out (1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers favour some students over others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a student is discriminated in regard to disciplinary policies, there is a higher likelihood that they will feel alienated from the learning institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who are discriminated and are given other roles which waste a lot of learning time may end up with poor academic performance which can result to the learning leaving school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who are discriminated by the teachers are likely to drop out of school to be away from the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers discriminate and hate those who perform poorly and in most cases such students feel stigmatized and end up dropping out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How else do students’ discrimination by teachers influence students’ drop-out?

Thank you
Appendix II: Interview Guide for Teachers

1. Does the school have enough resources for use in the passing and acquisition of knowledge to the learners?

2. What is the influence of school resources on drop-out in your school?

3. Do the school policies and practices in your school influence drop-out in your school?

4. Does the Principal leadership style relate well with the students?

5. Are the students involved in the schools decision making?

6. What is the influence of styles of leadership by the institutions’ heads on drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

7. Are students discriminated in your school?

8. Does students’ discrimination by teachers influence drop-out in secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub-County?

9. What other reasons lead to school drop-outs?
Appendix III: Interview Guide for Principal

1. Does the school have sufficient resources for use in the passing and acquisition of knowledge to the learners?

2. What is the influence of school resources on drop-out in your school?

3. Do the school policies and practices your school in influence drop-out in your school?

4. To what extent do school policies and practices in influence withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

5. Do you relate well with the students?

6. Are the students involved in the schools decision making?

7. What is the influence of styles of leadership adopted by the institutions’ heads on drop-out in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

8. Are there instances of students’ discrimination in your school?

9. Does students’ discrimination by teachers influence withdrawal in secondary institutions in Kikuyu Sub-County?

10. What other reasons lead to school drop-outs?
### Appendix IV: Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME IN MONTHS</th>
<th>FROM –TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>April –Oct 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting and instrument adjustments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>March–April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>June –Aug 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: Map of Study Area

Kikuyu Sub-County
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Our Ref: ESSAC/25933/2014

DATE: 2nd November, 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR REGINA WANGECI KIAMBATI –
NO. ESSAC/25933/2014.

I write to introduce Ms. Regina Wangeci Kiambati who is a Postgraduate Student of Kenyatta University. She is registered for M.Ed degree programme in the Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies.

Ms. Regina Wangeci intends to conduct research for a M.Ed Project Proposal entitled, “Contextual Socio-Economic Based factors Influencing Students’ Dropout in Public Secondary Schools in Kiambu County, Kenya”.

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. Lucy N. Mbaabu
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL
Appendix VII: Research Authorization from Nacosti

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref. No. NACOSTI/P/18/43000/22073

Date: 10th April, 2018

Regina Wangeci Kiambati
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “School based factors influencing drop-out rates in secondary schools in Kiambu Sub-County, Kiambu County,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Kiambu County for the period ending 9th April, 2019.

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

Kindly note that, as an applicant who has been licensed under the Science, Technology and Innovation Act, 2013 to conduct research in Kenya, you shall deposit a copy of the final research report to the Commission within one year of completion. The soft copy of the same should be submitted through the Online Research Information System.

DR. STEPHEN K. KIBIRU, PH.D.
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Kiambu County.

The County Director of Education
Kiambu County.
Appendix VII: Research Permit

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
MS. REGINA WANGECI KIAMBATI
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 23041-604
NAIROBI, has been permitted to conduct
research in Kiambu County

on the topic: SCHOOL BASED FACTORS
INFLUENCING DROP-OUT RATES IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KIAMBU
SUB-COUNTY, KIAMBU COUNTY

for the period ending:
9th April, 2019

Permit No : NACOSTI/P/18/43000/22073
Date Of Issue : 10th April, 2018
Fee Recieved : Ksh 1000

..............................
Applicant’s
Signature

..............................
Director General
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS

1. The License is valid for the proposed research,
research site specified period.
2. Both the Licence and any rights thereunder are
non-transferable.
3. Upon request of the Commission, the Licensee
shall submit a progress report.
4. The Licensee shall report to the County Director of
Education and County Governor in the area of
research before commencement of the research.
5. Excavation, filming and collection of specimens
are subject to further permissions from relevant
Government agencies.
6. This Licence does not give authority to transfer
research materials.
7. The Licensee shall submit two (2) hard copies and
upload a soft copy of their final report.
8. The Commission reserves the right to modify the
conditions of this Licence including its cancellation
without prior notice.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation

RESEARCH CLEARANCE
PERMIT

Serial No. A 18188
CONDITIONS: see back page