

Jimma University



**College of Education and Behavioral Science
Department of Educational planning and Management**

**Investigate the Causes of Educational Wastage in the
Government 2nd Cycle (5-8) Primary Schools of West
Hararghe Zone Oromia Regional State**

M.A Thesis

By- Dereje Gizaw Ayele

October, 2019

**Jimma University
Ethiopia**

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
POST GRADUATE COORDINATING OFFICE**

RESEARCH ON

**INVESTGATE THE CAUSE OF EDUCATIONAL WASTAGE INTHEGOVERNMENT
2nd CYCLE (5-8) PRIMERY SCHOOLS OF WEST HARERGHE ZONE OROMIA
REGIONAL STATE**

**ATHESIS SUBMITTED TO THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL
SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES JIMMA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OFMASTE OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (EDL)**

**BY
DEREJE GIZAW**

**OCTOBER, 2012
JIMMA UNIVERSITY
ETHIOPIA**

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that, the work which is being presented in the thesis entitled “The cause of educational wastage in the government second cycle (5-8) primary schools; in the case of west Harerghe zone, Oromia regional state “ in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the master degree of educational leadership is an authentic record of my own work carried out from May, 2019 to October, 2019 under the supervision of my advisor Abunu Arega (PHD), College of education and behavioral science, Jimma University, Ethiopia.

Author Name

signature

date

APPROVED BY:

Name

Signature

Date

Advisor

Examiner

Exam

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This thesis was produced not just based on the inputs I gathered but also due to commitment and support of several people and organizations. Therefore, I would like to sincerely thank them for their contribution to my thesis. First of all, I am grateful to my thesis advisor, AbunuArega (PhD) for his valuable and precious feedback and encouragement. Secondly, I would like to thank all the respondents and participants for their cooperation in providing all the necessary documents and time spent in filling the questionnaires, which helped me find the necessary relevant data. Finally, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to west Hararghe zonal and woreda educational offices for their continuous support. At all it's with a sincere gratitude that I acknowledge every single help provided for me in any way possible.

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at investigating wastage in second cycle primary education focusing on drop out and grade repetition limited to the case of west Hararghe zone. The study is based on the annual statistical abstract of the zonal education office (2009-2010) characterized high rate of dropout (19.3 and 17.9 percent) and grade repetition (8.4 and 7.5 percent). This indicates the low internal efficiency and high educational wastage. So, in order to achieve this purpose, descriptive research design was used. Primary and secondary data collection methods were implemented to collect data in twenty one target second cycle primary schools and zonal education offices. A total of five hundred thirty two respondent principals, teachers, students and parents participate in the study. The collected data was analyzed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software. So as to bring out the essential patterns the data was analyzed using quantitative methods and descriptive statistics is used in order to examine the pattern of the responses. Through this study, school based, learners and parents related causes to students dropout was revealed. And school based and instruction related causes to the students repetition were identified. The degree and weight of educational wastage in the second cycle primary schools were exposed; there are high dropout and repetition problems in the zone as well as in the sample schools.

The long distance from home to school; cultural impacts, parents lower standards of living, lack of parental encouragements of the students and lack of school facilities were the major causes of dropout forced the learners to give less attention to their learning, frequent absenteeism and lead them to score poor academic performance consequences to high repetition. So it recommended that the possible measures should be taken in order to handle the wastage in education through dropping out before effecting a particular level of education results, wastage in resources and reduce number of graduates then transfer to the grade repetition responsible for hinder the intake capacity of school.

ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

- EFA-Education For All
- EMIS-Education Management Information
- ESDP-Education Sector Development Program
- FAWE-Forum for Africa Women Education
- GDP-Gross Domestic Product
- IDCJ-International Development Center of Japan
- MDG-Millennium Development Goal
- MOE-Ministry of Education
- Mgt- Management
- SIP-School Improvement Program
- SPSS-Statistical Package for Social Sciences
- UBE-Universal Basic Education
- UN-United Nation
- WHES-West Hararghe Education Sector
- WHZEO- West Hararghe Zone Education Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	I
ABSTRACT.....	II
ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IV
List of Tables.....	VI
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Research Question.....	9
1.4. Objective of the Study.....	10
1.4.1. General Objective.....	10
1.4.2. Specific Objectives.....	10
1.5. Significance of the study.....	10
1.6. Delimitation of the Study.....	11
1.7. Limitation of the study.....	11
1.8. Definition of terms.....	12
1.9. Organization of the study.....	13
1.10. Assumption of the study.....	13
CHAPTER TWO.....	14
LITRATUREREVIEW.....	14
2.1 The concept and Meaning of educational wastage.....	14
2.2. Global overview of educational wastage.....	15
2.3. Educational wastage in developing countries.....	17
2.4. Education Wastage in the Context of Ethiopia.....	18
2.5. Wastage in education and forms of its existence.....	23
2.6. Wastage in Education and its Magnitude.....	24
2.7. Dropout and Repetition.....	25

2.7.1. Dropout.....	25
2.7.2. Repetition.....	28
2.8. Efficiency and coefficient of efficiency.....	29
2.9. Functionalism theory, 1938.....	29
CHAPTER THREE.....	32
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	32
3.1. Research Design.....	32
3.2. The Area of study.....	32
3.3. Sources of Data.....	33
3.4. Data Collection Tools.....	33
3.4.1. Questionnaires.....	34
3.4.2. Interview guide.....	34
3.5. Data collection procedures.....	34
3.6. Population and sampling technique of the study.....	34
3.7. Sample size and sampling procedure.....	35
3.8. Data Analysis techniques.....	36
3.9. Ethical Considerations.....	37
CHAPTER-FOUR.....	38
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY.....	38
4.1. Characteristics and Backgrounds of Respondents.....	38
CHAPTER FIVE.....	73
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	73
5.1 Summary.....	73
5.1.1.10 Instruction related factors to learner repetition respond by the repeater students.....	80
5.2. Conclusions.....	81
5.3 Recommendations.....	82
REFERENCE.....	85
Appendix.....	89

List of Tables

Table 1.1	The second cycle primary education dropout rate by grade level.....	7
Table 1.2	The second cycle primary education repetition rate by grade level.....	21
Table 1.3	Sample schools dropout and repetition rate.....	34
Table.1.4	Sample schools dropout rate by grade level	37
Table 1.5	Sample schools repetition rate by grade level	39
Table 2.1	Primary dropout rate by grade and gender (2010/11).....	40
Table 3.1	Distrbution of sample schools.....	41
Table 4.1	Description of principals and teachers respondents.....	42
Table 4.2	Description of student respondents.....	43
Table 4.3	Description of parents respondents.....	44
Table 4.4	Second cycle primary education dropout and repetition rate in the zone.....	45
Table 4.5	School based factors to learners dropout respond by principals & teachers.....	46
Table 4.6	Learner related factors to students drop out respond by principals & teachers.....	49
Table 4.7	Parent related factors to learner’s dropout respond by principals & teachers.....	52
Table 4.8	School based factors to learners drop out respond by students	55
Table 4.9	Parent related factors to learner’s dropout respond by student	56
Table 4.10	Learners based factors to school dropout respond by students.....	57
Table 4.11	School based factors to student’s repetition respond by principals & teachers.....	59
Table 4.12	The instruction related factors to students repetition respond by principals& teacher	64
Table 4.13	The school based factors to learners repetition respond by repeater students.....	69
Table 4.14	The instruction related factors to student’s repetition respond by repeater students	71
Table 4.15	School principals belief towards the problems of dropout and repetition in school	73
Table 4.16	Teachers belief towards the problems of dropout and repetition in the school	

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Education is a fundamental right of every person, a key to other human rights, and the heart of all developments, the prerequisite for equity, diversity and lasting peace. It is seen as a powerful means to reduce poverty and achieve economic growth (Breton, 2004).

It empowers people, improves individuals earning potential, promotes health population, is a major determinant of democracy and builds a competitive economy (Human and Buchman, 2002) few global goals have been consistently and deeply supported as the nation that every child in every country should have a chance to complete at least primary education (World Bank, 2003).

The education sector issues are generally seen as, an access to educational opportunities, equity in the distribution of educational services, structure of the education system, internal and external efficiency and institutional arrangement for the management of the sector. However educational issues are wide, this study is more emphasized on the problems of internal efficiency and effectiveness of education sectors implementation leads to educational wastage

1.1. Background of the study

The universal declaration of human rights, adopted in 1984 declared that everyone has a right to education. This calls is further supported by the world conference on education for all held in Jomtein, Thailand in 1990, and its follow up conference in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000. The intention of these country representatives was that, children, youth and adults would benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs. Since then, remarkable progress has been made in getting young children in developing countries in to primary school education. However, still millions of children dropout of school, shifting the problem from getting in to school to keeping them there (UNESCO, 2009).

Karimgani (2015:20) clarifying that, “Wastage means drop-out of pupils, i.e. leaving of the schools before completing the primary course. It means that, the number of primary school is

increasing every year; the enrolment in such schools is increasing every year and the expenditure on primary education has increased year after year. But unfortunately, there is not much increase in the literacy rate.”Kiumi and chary (2005) define educational wastage as the dual problem of class repetition and dropout. Repeaters deplete resources and causes wastage. Those who do not complete are not a useful man power and constitute wastage as well.

Wastage in education is a reflection of the degree of in efficiency in the system (Fry, 1990), has been considered as “the oldest and best known problem which has lost none of its gravity. It also results in poor cost effectiveness (Farrant,1980) and seriously hampers the effort towards the loss of achieving literacy (Tanguiane, 1990).Many researchers describe, a multiple of factors that make realization of educational objectives difficult. More precisely, it is a combined effect of the phenomena of grade repetition and dropping out in a particular cycle of education.

Rajesh and Roy (2014) clarifies that, the components of educational wastage are failure or grade repetition and drop out which means premature withdrawal. The main burdens of wastage are: Joblessness, less income earnings, increased criminality, public dependency and poor health. Further, the characteristics of wastage include the failure of a system to provide universal education, failure to recruit child within the system, hold children with in system, failure to set appropriate objectives and in efficiency in the achievement of objectives.

In Latin America, the educational flow of wastage case is manifested by unacceptably high dropout and repetition rates and low primary completion rates, when compared with similar indicators in more developed countries (Juan, 1992). A study by Desarrolo (2007) in Latin America noted that the number of repeaters increased with the expansion of schools in the region to accommodate for students.

A report published by the UNESCO (1967) noted that in countries which have high wastage ratios, repetition contributes more to wastage than does drop out, and repetition itself is commonly followed by drop out. The report goes on to argue that the reduction of wastage cannot be brought by a single method, but involves the whole educational system. However, Japan has largely overcome such problems of wastage and is more concerned with problems of absenteeism (UNESCO, 1967). India has also suffered by wastage and stagnation. Kothari

commission Report noted that parents in India sent children to school based on their usefulness at home. The report further argues that poor parents find it almost impossible to lose the assistance of their children at home.

In developing countries, wastage is also very common. This creates a serious situation because the funds available for educational development are limited and their effective use is considerably reduced by wastage. Gateway (1998) argues that while developing countries have done remarkably well in terms of expanding educational access to a large percentage of their school going population, school performance as measured by dropout rates, progression rates and examinations results has been quite discouraging. Most African countries are faced by the educational wastage problem and have come up with initiatives to curb the problem.

Nigeria, has adopted the education sector as one of the pillars of poverty reduction. It is argued that wastage is unprofitable and uneconomical utilization of time and resources(Adamu-2000;Samu'el 2004;Oyeteikin 2011).Adamu(2000)argue that repetition of classes may have negative effect on students and parents; therefore, the development of each child must be directed towards the ability of the child, bearing in mind the needs of society.

Ncube (2004) in a study in Zimbabwe found that the number of students repeating a grade increases with level of schooling. Ncube noted that, of the 2527 repeaters over a period of four years, 5.7% were in form one, 7.6% in form two, 30.2% in form three and 56.5% in form four. There is also a problem of high repetition and low progression rate. It is clear there is an educational wastage problem in the African continent; hence, policies should be created and implemented to ensure that this wastage is reduced.

Developing countries are faced by many challenges such as poverty, unemployment, corruption and violence. These challenges are related to educational wastage because the cost of living in developing countries is high. There are sharp disparities between socio-economic classes, gender, geographical regions and generations, resulting to inequality, low access and non-participation of some individuals (UNESCO, 2005).

According to Forum for Africa Women Education (FAWE) 1997, poverty is the major cause of educational wastage and the girl child is the most affected.FAWE recommended that government,

communities and families need to advocate more on the right to education for all and especially for the girl child. Opportunity cost of sending girls to school, according to King and Hill (1993), is a major issue in female participation in educational process for instance; girls are expected to work as house helps to provide for their family. This may lead to drop-out. Although FAWE was more concerned about girl, boy child is also at a big rise of being equally wasted. Segedatal (1991) pointed that, despite the dramatic expansion of primary schools and increased enrollment in many of the developing countries, the number of pupils who successfully complete their education is still insufficient. (Tanguiane 1990) has also made a similar remark on this issue.

Drop-out rates are then commonly used perimeter to measure educational wastage of the education system. Repeating a grade means utilizing more resources than allocated to a student and hindering the intake capacity of schools. Similarly leaving a school (dropping) before completing a particular cycle level of education is wastage in resources, number of graduates and student years. In both cases the meager resources allocated for education were be wasted (UNESCO 1998:12).UNESCO's report (2003)

Different writers have suggested the reason for this failure, Habtamu (2002) and UNESCO (2003) confirmed that, wastage in the form of drop-out and grade repetition was a major hindrance.

According to West Hararghe zone education office Annual Abstract (2005-2010) there was high rate of drop- out and repetition of pupils at the primary schools consecutively. Recently, no known study has been made on the causes of pupils drop-out and repetition as a zone. So, the high wastage through (dropout and repetition) of primary education in the zone was clearly indicated that, there is great challenge in achieving the goal of primary education. Therefore, the researcher is felt to investigate the causes that influence student's dropout and grade repetition.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As UNESCO (2003) indicated that, children around the world, especially sub-Saharan Africa countries, fail to gain access to primary schooling. Even large numbers among those who do enroll leave prematurely, dropping-out before the skills of numeracy and literacy have been properly gained. This initiates for a close Investigation of the degree of educational wastage of primary schools.

Ethiopia has the statistics on “readmits” that drop out during the school year and return to the same grade in the next school year. Therefore, the repetition rates are lower when comparing with other countries, while at the same time, the dropout rates rise, according to the MOE(MOE,2011a).Regarding the dropout rates, by grade, the rate of grade-8 was the highest at 12.3% especially, the rate of girls was 15% which was significantly higher than that of boys of 9.9%.The rates were also high in grades 5and7 which are consistent with the grades with low promotion rates and high repetition rates(MOE2011a)(Table4-7).

The analysis made by Ministry of Education on Program Action Plan 2008-2012E.c indicate that, the main challenges needs to focus on to implement were student’s grade repetition and schools drop-out. The reason is that, the overall goal of the education sector development program (ESDP) was “to achieve the MDGs” through increase access and ensure equity, providing quality education and lowering education inefficiency. For instance the target planned to reduce grades repetition and schools dropout for primary education by2014/2015G.c was 1%.But couldn’t be realizing the target and still the problem is not basically solved.

In West Hararghe zone, a very great number of students were dropped-out of the schools and repeating in the same grade. The zone has 15 woredas and 2 town administrations. As population and house commission census (1999) E.C, more than 2, 272, 316, (M- 51.2% and F- 48.8%) peoples were living in it. Most of them are living in agricultural work. The zone has diversified topography and climate. So, in order to provide education for the people, 339 1st level primary schools and 566 2nd level primary schools were opened and many students have been learning in it. However-many students were enrolled in to the schools year after the year, the completion and promotion rate seen at the end of years were below the expecting target. To be justifying the severity of the problems in primary schools, the following evidences were organized.

According to the analysis made by West Hararghe Education Office(WHEO), five years transformation and development Plan (2008-2012) clarifying that the rate of drop-out of the second cycle (5-8)primary learners as Oromia region, Education Bureau in 2006 Ac/Year was,17.8% while 26.6 % drop-out rate in West Hararghe zone on the same year. Moreover, the statistical data reports of West Hararghe zone, educational office in2009and 2010Ac/year, the drop-out rate of the primary learners of the second cycle (5-8) primary schools were, 19.3%

and 17.9%. On the other hand, the repetition rate of the primary learners of 2nd-cycle (5-8) primary schools the same year were 8.4% and 7.5%. The data is indicated that, there was high drop-out and repetition in the second cycle (5-8) primary schools under the zone

Table 1.1-The Second Cycle Primary Education Dropout-rate by Grade level

Year	Grade-5			Grade-6			Grade-7			Grade-8			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2009	20.9	26.3	23.6	17.3	22.9	20.1	16	23.3	19.6	9.3	18.2	13.8	15.9	22.7	19.3
2010	20.2	27.0	23.6	15	19.9	17.4	15.3	21.6	18.4	8.7	15.6	12.2	14.8	21	17.9
Total	20.6	26.7	23.6	16.2	21.4	18.8	15.7	22.5	19	9	16.9	13	15.4	21.9	18.6

(Source-WHZE0 Annual Statistical Abstract 2009-2010)

On the above table, in the year 2009, there were dropout rate of learners 20.9 %, 26.3% and 23.6% in 5th grade respectively. In the next 2010 a year 20.25% , 27%, and 23.6% dropout rate was indicated in the same grade. In the same year 2009 there were, 17.3%, 22.9% and 20.1% of drop out were rated both sexes of learners in grade 6th respectively. In the next 2010, there were 15%, 19.9% and 17.4% percentages of dropout rate were rated in the same grade. In grade 7th there were, 16%, 23.3% and 19.6%, of dropout rate were shown in the 2009, where as in 2010, there were 15.3%, 21.6% and 18.4% of dropout rate was rated in both sexes, in the same grade respectively and In grade 8th there were 9.3%, 18.2%, and 13.8% dropout rate was rated in the year 2009, Whereas in the year 2010, there was 8.7%, 15.6% and 12.2% percentage of dropout rate were rated in both sexes in 8th grade respectively. So related to the grade level, the table shows that, there was high dropout rate in 5th, 6th and 7th grade persistently. Where as in grade 8 there was moderate dropped out rate but significant number of learners were dropped out of the system by the time.

Table 1.2- The Second Cycle Primary Education Repetition rate by Grade level

Year	Grade-5			Grade-6			Grade-7			Grade-8			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2009	7.7	8.1	7.9	7.4	7.7	7.5	8.7	9.4	9.1	7.4	11	9.2	7.8	9.1	8.4
2010	7.1	8.1	7.6	6.9	8.4	7.6	7.4	8.8	8.1	5.6	8.1	6.8	6.8	8.3	7.5
Total	7.4	8.1	7.75	7.15	8.05	7.55	8.05	9.1	8.6	6.5	9.55	8	7.3	8.7	7.95

(Source-WHZE0 Annual Abstract 2009-2010)

According to the data shown by grade level in the table, in 5th grade there were 7.7% males, 8.1% females and total 7.9% repetition rate in the year 2009 respectively. In the same grade by the year 2010, there were 7.1% males, 8.1% females, and 7.6% total repetition rates shown evidently. In 6th grade there were 7.4% males, 7.7% females and total percentage of 7.5% repetition rate in 2009. In the next year 6.9% males 8.4% females, and total 7.6% result were shown in the same grade. In 7th grade there were 8.7% males, 9.4% females and total 9.1% shown in the year 2009. In the next year, 7.4% males, 8.8% females and 8.1% total percentages repetition rate respectively and also in grade- 8 highest number of repetition rate were recorded in each respective year. So, these data were demonstrated that, highest percentage of repeater students in all grades on both consecutive years.

Table 1.3- Sample Schools Dropout and Repetition rate

No	Year	Grade	Dropout rate			Repetition rate			Total		
			M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	2006	5-8	5.9	6.6	6.25	4.6	3.7	4.15	10.5	10.3	10.4
2	2007	5-8	4.9	5.2	5.05	4.1	5.98	5.04	9.0	11.18	10.09
3	2008	5-8	10.3	9.28	9.79	5.98	7.0	6.49	16.28	16.28	16.28
4	2009	5-8	7.5	7.2	7.35	6.1	4.9	5.5	13.6	12.1	12.85
5	2010	5-8	6.1	6.50	6.3	4.1	4.2	4.15	10.2	10.7	10.45
		5-8	6.94	6.95	6.95	4.98	5.15	5.16	11.92	12.10	12.11

Source-(School Level Annual Statistics and Annual Reports 2006-2010)

According to the evidence indicated in the table 6.25%, 5.05%, 9.79%, 7.35% and 6.3% percentage of dropout rate and 4.15%, 5.04%, 6.49%, and 5.5% and, 4.15% repetition rate were shown in the consecutive years (2006 to 2010) respectively. The total percentage of dropout and repetition rate was 10.4%, 10.09%, 16.28%, 12.85% and 10.45% in the same year respectively. So this evidence implies that there was high wastage of education indicated due to dropouts and repetition in the sample schools.

Table 1.4-Sample Schools Dropouts' Rate by Grade levels

Year	Grade Level														
	5			6			7			8			5-8		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2006	6.2	7.5	6.8	7.34	3.9	5.6	9.9	6.3	8.1	9.0	8.2	8.6	8.1	6.5	7.3
2007	3.95	8.2	6.1	5.03	8.4	6.7	4.5	3.2	3.9	5.9	11.3	8.6	4.9	7.8	6.4
2008	10.6	9.95	10.3	11.1	7.5	9.3	9.5	9.5	9.5	29.2	10.0	19.6	15.1	9.2	12.2
2009	8.9	7.97	8.4	7.4	8.3	7.9	8.9	9.0	8.95	3.0	2.8	2.9	7.1	7.0	7.1
2010	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	7.3	9.8	8.6	6.3	5.1	5.7	6.2	6.5	6.4

(Source-Primary School annual data, rooster, and reports 2006-2010)

According to the data indicate in the table, there were dropout rate of 6.8%in grade five,5.6% in grade six,8.1%in grade seven and 8.6% in grade eight shown in the year 2006 respectively. In the year 2007, there were dropout rate of 6.1% in grade five, 6.7%in grade six, 3.9% in grade seven, and8.6%in grade eight seen respectively. In the year 2008,there were 10.3%of dropout rate in grade five,9.3%in grade six,9.5% in grade seven and 19.6% indicated in grade eight respectively. In the year 2009 there were 8.4%dropout rate in grade five,7.9 % in grade six,8.95% in grade seven, and 2.9% in grade eight respectively. In the year 2010, there was 5.6%, 5.6%, 8.6% and5.7%of dropout rates indicated in grade (5-8) respectively.

So, the organized evidence in grade (5-8) indicates that, there were high dropouts of students in all school years, but number fluctuation was seen between the school years for each grade respectively.

Table 1.5- Sample Schools Repetition rate by Grade levels

Year	Grade Level														
	5			6			7			8			5-8		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2006	4.5	4.6	4.6	0.8	4.9	2.8	7.2	3.4	5.3	6.4	3.3	4.8	4.6	3.7	4.2
2007	2.3	2.9	2.6	4.4	5.6	5.0	7.3	12.8	10.1	2.6	2.6	2.6	4.1	5.98	5.1
2008	8.6	11.6	10.0	4.6	4.5	4.6	7.9	6.2	7.1	5.6	3.4	4.5	6.0	7.0	6.5
2009	7.6	5.3	6.4	3.8	5.0	4.4	7.1	4.7	5.9	5.99	4.9	5.4	6.1	4.9	5.5
2010	4.5	5.7	5.1	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.9	2.6	3.2	3.3	4.4	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.2
Tot	5.5	6.0	5.8	3.6	4.9	4.3	6.7	5.9	6.3	4.8	3.7	4.3	5.0	5.16	5.1

(Source-Primary School annual data, rooster, and reports 2006-2010)

Concerning repetition rate in the sample schools, there were a min. of 2.6 and the max. of 10.0 repetition rate were notified in 5th grade in the years 2006 to 2010 respectively. In 6th grade the min. of 2.8 and max. 5.0 repetition rates were indicated in the table. In 7th grade the min. 3.2 and the max of 10.1 were demonstrated in the year 2006 to 2010 respectively. In 8th grade there were 2.6 min and 5.4 max of repetition rate shown in the table correspondingly. Therefore these data pointed that, there was rate differences seen in grade level as well as in the given years. And there was high repetition rate in grade five and grade seven in the year 2007 and 2008 obviously. So that, the basic problem that has initiated the researcher to conduct this study was high educational wastage i.e. high rate of dropout and repetition in the zone.

Hence, In order to identify the extent and the problems of education wastage in the zone, the rate of drop-outs, repetition and promotion were examined. The relationships between teachers' characteristics, School characteristics, teaching materials and wastage in repetition rate and drop-out rates had been investigated. An attempt were also made to identify the major causes of wastage in terms of repetition and dropping out and to show whether or not there was an identified pattern in wastage rates by sex and grade level.

1.3. Research Question

The study aims to answer the following basic research questions.

1. What is the major cause of students' drop-out in 2nd level (5-8) primary schools of west Hararghe zone?
2. What is the major cause of students' grades repetition in 2nd level (5-8) primary schools of west Hararghe zone?
3. What extent and its influence of education wastage in second level (5-8) primary schools of west Hararghe zone?

1.4. Objective of the Study

1.4.1. General Objective

The major objectives of this study is to explore the extent and its influences of education wastage in the primary education and identify the major causes of the problems and find out effective solution and to give scientific judgment for the difficulty of education wastage through dropout and repetition in the 2nd cycle primary schools of West Harerghe zone.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

1. To investigate the major cause of learners schools drop-out in selected 2nd level primary schools of west Harerghe zone.
2. To investigate the major cause of grades repetition in selected 2nd level primary schools of west Harerghe zone.
3. To justify the extent and its influence of educational wastage in 2nd level primary schools of west Harerghe zone.
4. To find out the possible solution about the problems of education in the second level primary school of west Harergh zone.

1.5. Significance of the study

Addressing the issue of educational wastage would hold children within the system and reduce youth from Joblessness. The education sector would use the findings to formulate educational policies while parents and the community would also use for in counseling the students towards quality performance, retention and completion of the second- level primary education. The findings of the study would also offer lessons to all key stakeholders in education, for instance it would shed light on the factors influencing educational wastage as well as strategies that need to be taken to minimize and eventually eradicate educational wastage in the form of drop out and repetition. The school leaders would also get in sight on how to organize school structures and develop school cultures that promote students for achievement and retention. In short, the research felt that the need of study may give the better understanding to the people and government and will help in taking the necessary steps to tackle the factors affecting towards the educational wastage in primary education with the selected woredas of the west Hararghe zone.

The research may also contribute literature on the study of educational wastage in the study area of second-level primary schools and it will served as source of information for those who wants to do farther research about the issue in the future.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

There are a number of issues concerning of the educational wastage such that, access, equity, internal and external efficiency and structure of the education system. This study is delimited on the problems of internal efficiency (dropout and repetition) that leads to educational wastage. The causes to students dropout and grade repetition were investigated. The degree and the influence of wastage in education were identified. Then the mechanisms to overcome such problems were recommended in the education system of second cycle primary schools of west Hararghe zone.

1.7. Limitation of the study

There were some challenges in gathering adequate information. The researcher also faced difficulties in getting questionnaire respondents. Each step of the data collection process was involved participation in the form of providing learned, truth-full and accurate responses to the issue. Therefore, the researcher had been sensitive to assure of negative perception of questions and comments during all interviews. The Directorates of some education office and some school principals were tried to impose the researcher to distribute the questionnaires to the school they want and respondents they approve. Some teacher respondents especially (females) invited to fill the questionnaire were not interested to the part of participants. To overcome these challenges, the researcher take major to frequently orient and convinced them the procedure that the research had followed and it should be practiced. The other challenges hinder the researcher in some sample woredas were the problem of arriving all planned sample schools to be the parts of research. Then because of the peace and the transportation problem in the selected sample woredas the researcher was forced to add one other sample woreds to be compensate the dropped school.

1.8. Definition of terms

- Coefficient of efficiency-is the inverted form input /output ratio reflecting the degree of efficiency of educational or a school system.
- Dropouts-pupils who for one or another reason leave school before completing the grade or the educational cycle for which they are enrolled.
- Educational wastage-refers to pupils' high dropping out and repetition rate results the blocking access to schooling or lower the access and coverage to primary education and there by prolong the target year for achieving the expected goal and the resources wasted while they have used in school.
- Efficiency- refers to the relationship between input in to the (educational) system and outputs from the system. Effectiveness is “a measure of the disparity between the expectation and performance, or the extent to which an output accords with a stated goal.
- Failures- pupils who could not meet school requirements to promote from one grade to the next, and who may repeat the same grade next year.

- Input -the number of pupils initially enrolled in a given grade at a given level of education.
- Input -output ratio-an indicator of efficiency with which a school produces a given number of graduates. If the educational system is completely efficient, the input /output ratio will be one).
- Internal efficiency-the relationship between the inputs and outputs of an education system.
- Output-is the number of pupils who successfully complete a given educational cycle (In the case of Primary education).
- Repetition-retaining of pupils' in a grade previously attended for a year or more due to (in most cases) his/her unsatisfactory academic performance.
- The internally efficient education system-one which turns out graduate without wasting any student year (without drop out and repeaters)

1.9. Organization of the study

This study was organized in to five chapters.1st chapter were presented the background of the study, statement of study problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, hypothesis, significance of the study, limitations and delimitation of study, definition of terms and the organization of study.2nd chapter, deals with the literature review which was organized in to sub themes and had a conceptual and theoretical framework. Chapter three was presented the research methodology. This describes the research design, the target population, sampling techniques, sample size, research instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques. Chapter four were presented data obtained from field, its analysis, interpretations and discussion. Chapter five had contained the summary of the study's, conclusions and recommendations

1.10. Assumption of the study

The study were found on the assumptions that: all the respondents were willing to cooperate, all respondents were provided reliable responses, those affected were remember how each factor influenced wastage and reducing wastage among students, would improve quality of education, increase completion and Survival rates of students in the west Hararghe zone.

CHAPTER TWO

LITRATUREREVIEW

Introduction

Educational wastage is phenomenon that can be considered to emanate from failures, stagnation and drop-out. The extent and causes of educational wastage may however differ from country to country, region to region, school to school and so on.

This certainly creates difficulties for research in educational wastage. It is necessary at this, stage to clearly state what precise meaning to convey by “educational wastage”. Many researchers has in a study of educational wastage at the primary level defined as follows: If a child leaves the school without completing the primary course or it fails in a class, then the investment does not give commensurate returns. As such, both the money and human resources are wasted. This is what we call educational wastage. This educational wastage has two components- grade repetition and drop- out which means premature withdrawal

2.1 The concept and Meaning of educational wastage

Meaning of wastage: Wastage means dropout of pupils i.e. leaving the schools before completing the primary course. The number of primary schools is increasing in our country every year. The enrolment in such schools is increasing every year; the expenditure on primary education has increased year after year. But unfortunately, there is not much increase in the literacy rate. Children generally join schools during the age of 5-7 years, but start dropping off from the age of 9 years. Thus all students who enter the educational system do not complete the full level of the system for which they are enrolled and leave or drop out somewhere in the middle. This is known as wastage. So if any child leaves school before this stage it becomes a case of wastage. When students leave the school before the completion of stage of education, the time, money and energy spent on his education is a great national wastage. A UNESCO study lists India among countries where the drop-out in primary schools is very high. Prof. J.P. Naik had aptly remarked ‘of every 100 children who are admitted in primary schools in class I, about 1/3 drop off at the end of class I and only 1/3 reach class V. The Indian government, after the attainment of independence, stressed the need of primary education and provided funds for its

development, but a scrutiny of statistics reveals that the desired success has not been achieved due to certain reasons. Since the children leave the school before completion of their courses, the time of both the teacher and the taught are wasted. The available statistics reveal that till 1992, 40% of the children have dropped out before completing primary education. (*Wastage and Stagnation in Primary Schools Jayeeta Bhatta charjee* Volume-I, Issue-V March 2015- 20)

2.2. Global overview of educational wastage

‘Universal primary education’ is a Millennium Development Goal of the United Nations, declared in September 2000. The target of declaration is to “ensure that, by 2015, children elsewhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling” (United Nations, 2008). The Dakar Framework for Action has reaffirmed education as fundamental human right and underlined the importance of right-based government action in implementing ‘Education for All’ at the national level (Tomasevski, 2004). In order to meet the target of the Millennium Development Goal, Nepal is committed and has adopted the ‘Education for All’ strategy and a National Plan of Action (EFA 2001-2015) since 2001 (DOE,2009) declaring free, compulsory and accessible primary education to every child of primary school age. Considering the present day needs of education considering the present day needs of education in the global context, the government of Nepal has made various interventions and launched different programs with a view to improving access and quality of education. As a result, there has been a remarkable improvement in the educational attainment of both men and women over the years in Nepal with a steady improvement in the overall literacy rates (Government of Nepal, 2006). However, Nepal has faced several challenges in educational development. Poor quality and low efficiency are the crucial problems of this challenge (CERID, 2001). The low efficiency rate in primary education is causing huge national resource wastage hindering the effort of achieving quality basic education for all. The education sector receives a large share of public expenditure at present. The wastage in education refers to failure of a system to provide universal education, failure to recruit and hold children into system, failure to set appropriate objectives and inefficiency in the achievement of objectives. Raising enrolment, maintaining stability and reducing the dropout rate is the key to universal primary education. Unfortunately, high dropout rates and grade repetition are two major symptoms of educational wastage which seriously affect Education for All goals and also the key impediments to increasing educational access and

attainment. High repetitions are often correlated with high dropouts (Eiseman, 1997). The issue of dropout and grade repetition is of major concern given the goal of universal primary education. Studies have showed the low efficiency rate of primary education in Nepal. This is mainly due to high rate of grade repetition and dropout (CERID, 2001). Karki (2009) concluded that the high dropout in primary education was causing low efficiency and 'huge wastage' in primary education. Likewise, Acharya, (2007) showed an alarming rate of dropout and repetition especially of *Dalits* in primary schools in Nepal. Present paper is an attempt along similar lines, to analyze the status of dropout and grade repetition in primary education, focusing on the case of Palpa District, Nepal.

In Latin America, the educational flow wastage argument is manifested by unacceptably high dropout and repetition rates and low primary completion rates, when compared with similar indicators in more developed countries (Juan, 1992). For instance, Juan (1992) indicates that primary completion rate in the Mexican educational system in 1977 was 42%, with some poorer states, like Chiapas & Oaxaca registering less than 20%. A study by Desarrolo (2007) in Latin America noted that the number of repeaters increased with the expansion of schools in the region to accommodate for students. A report published by the UNESCO regional office for education in Asia (1967) noted that in countries which have high wastage ratios, repetition contributes more to wastage than does drop out, and repetition itself is commonly followed by drop out. The report goes on to argue that the reduction of wastage cannot be brought by a single method, but involves the whole educational system. However, Japan has largely overcome such problems of wastage and is more concerned with problems of absenteeism (UNESCO, 1967). India has also suffered wastage and stagnation. Kothari commission Report noted that parents in India sent children to school based on their usefulness at home. The report further argues that poor parents find it almost impossible to lose the assistance of their children at home. Based on the Kothari Report, wastage and stagnation causes are categorized into three namely, social causes which include caste distinctions, early marriages, and opposition to send grown up girls in mixed schools; educational causes which include ill-equipped schools, poorly housed and with dull and depressing enrolment, lack of adequate accommodation, too much overcrowding in schools, inefficient teachers, frequent transfer of teachers and poor quality of teachers; miscellaneous

causes which include illness and/or death of parent. Hinnun& Park (2004) also found that in China, repetition rates increased with increase in student numbers.

2.3. Educational wastage in developing countries

In developing countries, wastage is also very common. This creates a serious situation because the funds available for educational development are limited and their effective use is considerably reduced by wastage. Gatawa (1998) argues that while developing countries have done remarkably well in terms of expanding educational access to a large percentage of their school going population, school performance as measured by dropout rates, progression rates and examinations results has been quite discouraging. Necessary Most African countries are faced by the educational wastage problem and have come up with initiatives to curb the problem. Nigeria, has adopted the education sector as one of the pillars of poverty reeducation. It is argued that wastage is an unprofitable and un economical utilization of time and resources (Adamu 2000,Oyeteikin 2011).Adamu (2000)argue that repetition of classes may have negative effect on students and parents; therefore, the development of each child must be directed towards the ability of the child, bearing in mind the needs of society. Akindele (2015) stated that the analysis of efficiency in education is in ensuring optimal uses of meager resources allocated to education in order to eliminate wastage. In Zambia, educational wastage is very old. For many reasons, wastage is rampant at the secondary level, while the non-formal sector is incapable of catering effectively for those adversely affected due to a variety of factors (Lawrence, 1995).

Developing countries are faced by many challenges such as poverty, unemployment, corruption and violence. These challenges are related to educational wastage because the cost of living in developing countries is high. There are sharp disparities between socio-economic classes, gender, geographical regions and generations, resulting to inequality, low access and non-participation of some individuals (UNESCO, 2005).

According to Psacharopolous and Wood hall (1985) factors influencing school wastage are poverty, which may give rise to illness, malnutrition, absenteeism, high opportunity cost of schooling for poor families, cultural factors, which affect girls in particular, inappropriate curriculum factors which is excessively academic and designed to prepare majority of pupils for

upper secondary and higher education, and a shortage of secondary school places which lead to depletion at the primary level. The Status of Wastage in Universal Basic Education Program Implementation in Nigeria. The extent of wastage in the course of implementing Universal Basic Education (UBE) program in Nigeria can be proved by making reference to some literatures on the issue. In this regard, Duze (2011) investigated attrition rates in selected primary schools in Delta State, Nigeria using 5, 545 pupils of 2003 cohort. Findings revealed average attrition rate (19.24%). While the highest rate (36.60%) was recorded in the public/rural/small school, the lowest (7.24%) was recorded in private/urban/large school. The study also found higher attrition rates in the boys schools and in public than private schools, rural than urban schools as well as in small than in large schools. Adeyemi&Adu (2012) also studied teachers' quality and internal efficiency in primary schools in Ekiti State using 520 primary schools and a cohort of 91, 560 pupils of 2003 set who graduated in 2008. Findings revealed high dropout and repetition rates among the pupils. Although the rates revealed decreasing trend, it was 3,450 repeaters and 1,160 dropouts out of the cohort in 2003, which was 1,421 repeaters and 3,471 dropouts as at 2008. Adeyemi (2012) in another study on schools' variables and internal efficiency of secondary schools in Ondo State using 242 out of 295 secondary schools in the State and a cohort of 75,260 pupils of 2002 JSSI set found that there were 2,800 repeaters and 2,180 repeaters out of the cohort in 2003 which decreased to 2,255 repeaters and 1,950 dropouts in 2004 (when the pupils were in JSS3). The number of promoters in primary schools in Ekiti State was also found to be high in each of the years. In addition, Ajayi&Mbah (2008) studied the trend in educational wastage rates in Ekiti State's public primary schools in Nigeria from 2000 to 2006 using 731 public primary schools in the sixteen Local Government Areas in the State. Findings revealed 9.0%, 8.8%, 8.7%, 7.7%, 8.1% and 7.4% as repetition rates for year 2000 to 2006 respectively. As regards the dropout rates, it was 2.1%, 2.3%, 2.2%, 2.0% and 1.5% from 2000 to 2006 respectively. Apart from literature so reviewed, Data in Table 1 show the grade repetitions and dropout rates in UBE as at year 2008.

2.4. Education Wastage in the Context of Ethiopia

Education Division Documents No.II Education in Ethiopia 1974-82 The impact of Swedish Assistance, An evaluation by Rolf Samuelsson Indicate that, The literacy late was in 1982 estimated to be some 55 % of the population of ten years and older. In the same year, over of the

school age population was enrolled in primary schools. There are about 75 000 inhabitants per doctor. Life expectancy is around 45 years. After the revolution, the new government declared that the basis for building a socialist Ethiopia. Consequently, it also stated that the ownership and control of resources vital to economic development and to social services would be transferred to the government. A series of reforms were introduced in 1975 and 1976 with the aim of eradicating "the old and backward bureaucratic administrative system which had been bottlenecks and hindrance to progress and to the planning and administration of various projects in all national development sectors, including education" (Ministry of education, 1983, p 2).

Several of the reforms had a direct bearing of the formation of the education system. The Rural Lands Proclamation of April 1975 and the Urban Lands Proclamation of July 1975, which provided for public ownership of rural and urban land and districts, contained provisions for building operating and coordinating, social services including education in co-operation with concerned government offices and agencies. The general policy for the development of the education system is spelled out in the program of the National Democratic Revolution of April 1976. This government guideline States that "There will be an educational program that will provide free education, step by step, to the broad masses. Such a program will aim at intensifying the struggle against feudalism, imperialism and bureaucratic capitalism.

All necessary measures to eliminate illiteracy will be undertaken. All necessary encouragement will be given for the development of science, technology, the arts and literature. All necessary effort will be made to free the diversified cultures of Ethiopia from imperialist cultural domination and from their own reactionary characteristics. Opportunities will be provided to allow them to develop, advance and grow with the aid of modern means and resources" (Ministry of Education, 1981, pg 7) -

Building on the policy guidelines cited above and the organization of the Ethiopian people into Peasant and Urban Dwellers' Associations, the government promulgated the Proclamation for Administration and Control of the Schools by the People (Proclamation No. 103 of 1976), also called the "Education Proclamation" This proclamation firmly put school management committees in charge of schools at local level. It also emphasized the importance of parents and communities to become engaged in the sphere of education, which was made possible the

decentralization of administration. This measure, directory in line with the general objective of transferring ownership and control to the public, has had a profound impact on the running and financing of education. Has also, together with the nationalization of private schools through the Proclamation to Provide for Public Ownership of Private schools of 1975, facilitated the allocation of land for educational projects and provided "an solganisation frame work " for community support in cash and kind for a range of educational programmed (Ibm.,p10).

Priority in education in 1976 and 1977, Ethiopia was rocked by internal turmoil and external threats. Much of the development that had been initiated shortly after the revolution came to a standstill. Production stagnated and GDP per capita declined by 2 % on an annual basis. The education sector was also affected. Primary schools were closed and off, making schooling sporadic. Secondary schools were closed for an extended period. Teacher training institutions stopped producing teachers during the second half of the1970's. In short, many aspects of administration and organization of services and production were in shambles.

By the second half of 1978, much of the situation was in the hands of the government and the security problems were contained. The government and the people could once again concentrate on the transition from one Socio-economic system to another, a difficult risk in itself. The main objectives of the BEDC are the development of social services. These services include the provision of educational facilities and related inputs. The First Program had to lay the foundation for alleviating the country's social problems, that to unemployment and inadequacy of essential social services"(SIDA, 1980, p 4).The second Program 1979 had two objectives pertaining to education. One was to "distribute economic and social benefits in an equitable way to the people" (Ibid., p 5) and the other t accelerate the socialization process (Ibid., p 5).

.In general, an effective mobilization of existing manpower resources is seen as a prerequisite to development. Furthermore, "real development" hinges on mass participation and contribution as well as the quality of human resources. As has been implied earlier, cooperation between government and Community is emphasized. Indeed, it is the basis for mass participation, which is seen as intrinsic to the process of raising the quality of human resources. The education system is thus seen as "an instrument for raising the general cultural level of our people and as a democratic process (Government of Socialist Ethiopia, 1982, p 1).In conformity with this

philosophy, the two foremost priorities in education in Ethiopia are the eradication of illiteracy together with the provision of a programmed of basic education and the establishment of a system of “general education. Education priority is also to the development of higher and extended polytechnic schools on a limited scale and to the creation of training centers for the adult population.

In line with mass participation, priority is also given to the development of educational facilities in rural areas .Furthermore, the education offered has to mirror the needs and immediate problems of each community and provide the knowledge and skills required for increased productivity and improved standard of living. Much effort is directed towards developing a curriculum that will emphasize "education for production, research and a new way of live" (Ministry of Education, 1981, p 17) and towards elaborating programmers that will combine "learning with doing, and theoretical knowledge with practical activities" (Ibid., p 17) Source-(Education Division Documents No-11Education in Ethiopia-1974-82)

After the downfall of the Dergu government in 1984,In our country as well, the education and training policy has been formulated and implemented for some time and satisfactory results have been registered at all levels with respect to developing the educational participation and equity of education in the country. Education is a tool for the creation of citizens useful in the development of a country and change the attitude of a society towards the desired path; that introduces to latest technological discoveries and scientific inventions whereby accelerating the economic, social and cultural growth. In line with this, important activities are undertaken so far to improve the quality of education which include the empowerment of teachers; revision of the curriculum; decentralization of the education and training management down to woreda and school level; developing the sense of belongingness and role of the society in the educational works; increasing the supply of educational materials and assist the teaching methodology by technological inputs. In general, intensive effort was exerted to provide better quality and appropriate education at schools and institutions.

However, the desired result couldn't be achieved only through the aforesaid efforts. Periodic studies show that students at different level score low result. It is known that schools employ the routine practice in the learning-teaching process and not the systematic way which focuses on

improving the learning capacity of students and their result in all subjects. A system is not in place to identify the focus areas contributing for the improvement of results, review their practice and plan on the way forward. Hence, given the vitality of schools for the realization of quality of education, the improvement of their practice will be inevitable. Accordingly, reviewing and solving of the problems and defects witnesses in the process; identifying the important experiences to provide quality education in the country and compiling and extending the use of such experience will be crucial. As a result, experts from the Ministry of Education and regions gathered the best experiences from schools in the country and harmonized them with that of other countries to ensure the relevance and quality of education at school level and prepared the framework for school improvement which is now broadly implemented in all schools. Implementation of the School Improvement Framework in the country will make it possible for stakeholders to provide quality education at school level and identify the school domains that influence the learning outcomes of students; to set goals for each domain and act together on the improvement of the learning status and outcomes of students for reaching the desired level of quality. Hence, the Ministry of Education and regions jointly prepared this revised manual of implementation to be used by schools. For the successful implementation of this manual, structure and organization has been set up in accountable and responsible manner from the Federal Ministry of Education to Woreda and school level. This revised manual for the implementation of the School Improvement Program is aimed at saving the schools from impediments during the implementation stage and perform their functions in a speedy manner. The manual contains in sequential manner the definition and objectives; focus area of school improvement; strategy of implementation of the School Improvement Program; planning and implementation of School Improvement Program; monitoring and evaluation; meaningful involvement of stakeholders; school improvement management and structure; school finance system and incentive system is the focus area of the program. (SIP-Rev-By, MOE-2011)

In Ethiopia, efficiency decreases as grade rises. Internal efficiency of Ethiopia is not ranked low, compared to other African low income countries, but if the repetition rate gets even worse, it would easily fall into the low efficiency group. For example, Ethiopia's cohort-survival rates has not been improving as expected due to the rapid improvement in the intake rate, and lags behind those of other countries. The completion rate, decreases as grade rises. The repetition rate is not

so high compared to other countries but it could get worse in the absence of explicit attention to, the increasing number of repeaters in recent years,(WB,2005).As the factors of lowering internal efficiency, deterioration in quality of education and poor attractiveness of schools are pointed out (MOE,2010a).

Table 2.1 Primary Dropout Rates by Grade and Gender (2010/11)

	Grade-1	Grade-2	Grade-3	Grade-4	Grade-5	Grade-6	Grade-7	Grade-8	1-8
M	20.4	10.2	10.2	8.2	16.9	11.2	7.08	13.9	13.1
F	19.2	10.5	10.4	10.0	16.3	11.9	7.10	13.1	13.0
T	19.9	10.4	10.3	9.1	16.6	11.6	7.7	13.5	13.1

The repetition rates were 15.7%for boys and 18.6% for girls in 1996/97,which improve for both boys and girls and decreased to 3.7% in total in 2003/04(WB.2005).Then after, the rates remained at around 3%to6%,but in2009/10 itslightlyincreasedto8.5%in total (Moe,2005,2010c,2011(Annex4-9)The dropout rates had been improving since 2002/03 when the rate marked the peak of 19.2%, but it increased to 18.6% again in 2008/09.Comparing boys and girls, the dropout rates of boys were higher in many years, but in 2008/09 the rate of girls exceeded that of boys MOE,2005,2010c and2011).Regarding the improvement of repetition and dropout rates, the MOE set the target to improve them to 1.0% by 2014(MOE,2010a)..Source-(Basic Education Sector .AnalysisReport,Ethiopia-August2012,ByJICA,InternationalDevelopmentCenter of Japan(IDCJ).

2.5. Wastage in education and forms of its existence

According to Brimer and Pauli, (1971:9) educational wastage exists in a number of forms. There are five major forms through which educational wastage finds its existence:

- a. In the failure of a system to provide universal education
- b. In the failure to recruit children to the system
- c. In failure to hold children within the system
- d. In failure of the system to set appropriate objectives
- e. In inefficiency in the achievement of objectives

All forms of the existence of wastage listed above are not, however, mutually exclusive; rather they are related to another. The existence of wastage in one of its forms, if a timely measure is not taken to reduce it, will ultimately allow a room for another form of wastage that may ultimately lead the entire educational system to crisis. Inefficiency in the achievement of educational objectives that may be caused by various factors including the incidents of repetition and dropping-out or their combined effect, that has been hampered by an increasing drop-out and repetition rates or low performance level (Halper,1986: 193).

2.6. Wastage in Education and its Magnitude

In education or in industrial sectors, the existence of wastage of one kind or another seems to be unavoidable. with regard to this, Tadesse (1974:30) argues that wastage (in his case drop-out) is an “in destructible something”. Similarly, Chantavanich and Fry (1990) have also indicated that wastage of a certain magnitude is inescapable. All the effort is therefore, to minimize the gravity of the problem. In the study of wastage the examination of its magnitude, the existing evidence about its severity and status in the developing countries are points of great concern. In principle, a progressive educational system should, if not avoid, minimize the magnitude of wastage and expected to be less expensive by properly utilizing its scarce resources for educational development (Kobes, 1975, MOE, 1978a, E.C). But many studies have revealed that educational wastage is a pressing problem in the developing countries (UNESCO, 1984, Simmons, 1980, Thomas, 1975; Brimer and Pauli, 1971,; and Adams and Bjork, 1969). Besides low rate of school participation, the number of pupils who complete their education is decreasing. The fore-going discussion show that, in addition to low rate of primary school participation, high rate of wastage Has been a prevalent problem in many of the developing countries including Ethiopia (Tadesse, 1974; Kobes, 1975). Studies have shown that the problem is more serious in educationally less developed countries than in the developed ones (Brimers and Pauli, 1971).These pieces of evidence suggest that the problem of educational wastage is still graver in the developing countries. The underlying reasons for this have been identifying by (Simmons, 1980).These include:

1. Supply of fewer school places which, as Hallak (1990) puts it, is accompanied by high rates of drop-out, repetition, and high competition for admission.
2. Poor life situations that oblige most children to work to earn their living do not motivate them to have more years of schooling
3. Lack of parental encouragement due to economic or cultural reasons or interaction of both; for example, children from poor and uneducated families encountered such a problem.
4. The increasing cost of education has become high for the poor to afford and this would prevent children from entering or force them to leave school at their early age. However, what has to be noted is that those are not the only reasons for high rate of wastage in developing countries. The causes of wastage are varied and complex enough. What has been tried is to show why the phenomenon of wastage is more serious in developing countries than in the developed countries.

2.7. Dropout and Repetition

2.7.1. Dropout

(UNESCO, 1998), defines the term drop out as leaving a school before completion of a given stage of education or some intermediate or non-terminal point in level of education. The basic symptoms of wastage, in particular dropping out depend on the type of education system. It is defined in relation to the characteristics of the various educational systems. The duration of compulsory schooling and the periods between the ages into grades varies between countries of different educational systems. Based on these variations a drop out is here defined as a pupil who leaves school before the end of the final year of the educational stage in which he/she is enrolled. This means whether a pupil completes the compulsory education with a minimum age or not once he/she leaves the school before the end of the cycle is considered as a drop out. UNESCO, (1972: 15). This definition also applies for those countries, which do not have compulsory education laws. The term drop out is much related with the education cycle in which the pupil is involved. Therefore leaving school after the completion of a compulsory cycle without going on to the secondary cycle does not constitute drop out, because all national education policies do not allow all pupil to go to the next cycle. Some portion of Brimer the

pupil remains at the first cycle. Then, according to and Pauli (1972: 15), drop out at the primary level is virtually not existent in industrialized countries because they enforce compulsory education laws. In the less developed regions, however, early drop out is a major problem. There are three categories of theories that explain why drop outs abandon school; categories are “Drop-out” “Pullout” or “Push-out” theories (Glennie and Stern, 2002: 10).

“Drop out” refers to attributes of the individuals that precipitate early school departure. Factors like willingness and attitude of the student, health problem, and mal nutrition are examples of drop out theory. This theory, consider student personal characteristics as factors for dropping out of school. Lessanu (2004:30). Employment opportunities are also examples of pull out factors that attract students to drop out of school. School factors dispirit students from continuing with their education. Unattractive school condition, policy is some of the examples that can act as push factor to students. The tendency for students to drop out is also associated with their school experiences like: dislike of school: Low academic achievement: retention at grade level: a sense that teachers and administrators do not care about students; and inability to feel comfortable in a large, depersonalized school setting (U.S. Department of Education, 1999:31). In school factor that deter the attendance of students can be categorized as “push out” factors.

The first and most important reason for dropping out, especially in the developing countries is the „pull out“ factor. The need for having a time that would be used to sell the labor and in return get a means of subsistence in which the family or the individual would depend on has contributed to a greater proportion of school drop outs, Lessanu, (2004: 31).

Many studies have shown that, among other things, education systems in the developing countries are characterized by high drop-out rates and poor pupils’ performance (Carnoy, 1982). The problem is enormously widespread in many developing countries while it seems significant in the developed nations. Similar research findings also revealed that school drop-out is a serious and prevalent problem especially in low income countries (World Bank, 1990; IDRC, 1983) where education is less developed and resources are scarce (Bray, Clarke and The Stehen, 1986).

The phenomenon of dropping-out is a severe problem for the individual and the society. The individual will remain with low academic skill with little or no opportunity to obtain further education. The society, in addition to the foregone national income will face the consequence of

the problem in social, economic and cultural sphere (Rumberger, 1987). Thus dropping-out can be considered as a potential wastage of financial and human resources (Kobes, 1975; Elliot, Voss and Wendling, 1966). The fact that it is difficult to estimate the economic cost of education wasted due to early drop-out (Nattiello, McDill and Pallas, 1985) problem creates public alarm (Passow, 1977) and interest for those who are responsible for the financial and organizational accommodation (Binaminov and Glanman, 1982).

2.7.1.1. Drop-out Rates by Grade

Various studies show that drop-out rates are higher in the first level of education, especially in developing countries. For example, Brimer and Pauli reported that in thirty-six of the forty-six countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America the highest drop-out rate were observed in the first level (1971). The Chileans' case also reveals that drop-out rates were higher in the first two grades of the lower educational level (Blitz, 1965). According to his report 30 percent of children who entered in the first grade left the school within the first two years (1965: 306). With regard to this Simmons (1980) argues that in most countries, the wastage rate is bunched in the beginning grades of secondary education.

2.7.1.2. Drop-out Rates by Sex

Sex difference in drop-out rate is another area which has attracted the attention of researchers and policy makers. Basically, females' participation in education of the developing countries is lower rate participation can, partly, be explained by higher rates of drop-out among girls. Haddad et al (1990) and Hyde (1989) have also associated low educational attainment of females with the drop-out problem which is common tend to be disadvantaged than boys, rural children than urban children. According to Brimer and Paus' (1971) report dropping-out was higher among boys in urban schools and among girls in the rural schools. On the other hand, some studies have shown that no clear difference in the rate of drop-out was observed by sex (UNESCO, 1980; Bjerer, 1969). An earlier study in Ethiopia (Kyapaghian, 1960) recorded higher drop-out rate among girls while the other study which was conducted in by MoE (1978a E.C.) showed that quite opposite result. Although there seem to be inconsistency in the results presented above, the time factor has to be considered. But more recently, Anbassu and Junge (1988) and the report

from the Ministry of Education (MoE, 1988) recorded that the drop-out rates are higher among females than among males.

2.7.2. Repetition

Repetition is defined as “a year spent by a pupil in the same grade and doing the same work as in the previous year” Brimer and Pauli (1971: 18). In terms of cost, repetition increases education cost, because repeaters reduce the intake capacity of the school and prevent other children from entering school or causes overcrowding of classrooms. Repetition is one of the constraints of developing countries Psacharopoulos and Wood hall (1985: 209). Another form of school wastage occurs when occurs when pupils have to repeat grades. In developing countries especially, this is often a prelude to drop-out (UNESCO, 1998: 17). School systems around the world differ widely in their policies toward pupils who fail to master the work appropriate to a particular grade level. In a majority of countries, both developed and developing, educators require such pupils to repeat the grade in order to give them additional time and material that they failed to master the first time around. The practice is typically applied in grade 1 out of a conviction that it is important for pupils to get off to good start in their education. However, repeating the final primary grade is also widespread in countries where admission to secondary school is based on passing an end-of-primary school examination. A minority of countries appear to believe that repetition creates more problems than it solves and therefore follow a policy of automatic promotion. Accordingly, pupils proceed to the next grade even when they have not mastered the material of the previous grade. Some educators argue that pupils who did not learn something the first time are not likely to benefit from repeating the same academic year. A wiser policy, they argue, is to provide such pupil additional assistance and allow them to proceed to the next grade with their peers, (UNESCO, 1998).

2.7.2.1. Repetition Rates by Sex

Writers such as Bray, Clarke and Stephen (1986), and Brimer and Pauli (1971) contend that the tendency to repeat classes is higher among girls than boys. Contrary to this, other research findings showed that the level of repetition was higher among girls (UNESCO, 1984). Similar findings were recorded in sixty-six of the ninety countries studied around 1980. The study made between 1970 and 1980 (UNESCO, 1984) has also revealed lower repetition rates among girls than

among boys in all countries studied in Latin America, the Caribbean and Europe (UNESCO,1984).But the same study has shown that the percentage of repeaters in the majority of Africa countries was higher among girls than boys. This confirms the concentration of Bray, Clarke, and Stephen (1986). The percentage of repeaters in Ethiopia is also found higher among girls than boys (MOE, 1988; UNESCO, 1990).

2.8. Efficiency and coefficient of efficiency

The concept of “efficiency” as used by economists, refer to the relationship between the inputs in a system and the outputs or outcomes from the system. However, according to (UNESCO, 1998:17), measuring the efficiency of education system is problematic due to difficulties in defining and measuring educational outputs and outcomes as well as quantifying the relationship between inputs and outputs and/or outcomes. Any way an education system is considered to be efficient if it produces the desired outputs or outcomes at a minimum cost. The desired quality of output is measured in terms of a maximum number of pupils who have acquired the necessary knowledge and skill as prescribed by the society. Therefore, as stated above an education system is considered to be efficient if for a given input of resources (human, financial and material) is maximized the desired output both in quantity and quality. The coefficient of efficiency is the ratio of the optimal number of pupil –years required with no repetition and drop out, to produce a number of graduates from a given cohort which is expressed, as a percentage of the actual number of pupil-years spent to produce the same number of graduates. It measures the impact of drop-out and repetition combined in relation to graduates. The higher the co efficiency of efficiency the better and when the rate is 100 or close to 100 there is an efficient education

2.9. Functionalism theory, 1938

This study adopted functionalism theory, which is the work of Durheim (1938). The Sociologist compared societies to organisms with structures that consist of interrelated parts that work together to achieve a goal. If one part is affected it affects all the other parts ‘performance. Education is vital in maintenance of society as a whole. It happens in acquisition of skills, knowledge, values and attitude hence an important agent of socialization. The functionalists Approach views specific component parts of the school systems as performing specific and

complementary roles those are necessary if the school has to achieve its desired goals. One goal of education is to promote individual development and self-fulfillment. It should assist children to develop their potential interests and abilities. A vital aspect of individual development is character building. In this approach therefore, the component of the social system can be referred to as those that play their respective roles effectively to ensure the students participate in schooling and complete their secondary education successfully. These components include; parents, who play a crucial role in the early socialization of the students by helping them to learn and adapt to the values and norms of the society. The parents are obliged to ensure that students attend and continue with learning without disturbance by paying school fees, creating a conducive environment at home and becoming good role models to their children. The students, who according to the functionalists must view themselves as instruments which the future of society depend upon. The Students must be ready to be shaped by the teachers into responsible citizens by being guided to observe rules and regulations and core values at all cost. They are expected to make use of their abilities to fully harness their potential and get best out of education provided by the school curriculum. The schools viewed as a very vital component of the system. The school must have adequate facilities, enough teaching staff, and conducive teaching and learning environment. The quality of the school management, its ability to motivate both students and staff as well as ability to create team spirit are all vital considerations if the school has to achieve its goals. The roles played by the three components are complementary to each other and if one of them is faulty, the whole system will most likely not achieve the intended goals. A conflict may also arise if one of the components does not function well. The performance of these components of a school as social system will determine whether there is a smooth operation and continuation of the formal secondary education. The dependent variable in this study will be education wastage in public primary schools. Education wastage in public primary schools is influenced by several factors that constitute the independent variables. Based on the literature review the factors that influence education wastage in public primary schools includes schools based factors (teacher attitudes, syllabus coverage, general school discipline and class size), home-based factors (parental involvement, family structure, conducive home environment, opportunity cost of schooling and family size) and student-related factors (self-esteem, drug abuse, teenage pregnancies, peer influence, learners age and learners absenteeism). The intervening variables, which according to Kothari (2004) are variables that intervene

between cause and effect, includes guidance and counseling, government policies, religious and cultural practices.(Source)

Heisman, Rani, and Smits, (2010)-In their working paper “Keeping children in School” based on the household and district-level determinants of school

Dropout in 363 districts of 30 developing countries brought out the role socio-economic and cultural factors and of characteristics of the educational infrastructures on primary school enrolment. The sample constituted 70,000 children living in 439 districts of 26 states of India. The results indicated that most the variation in educational enrolment (around 70%) is explained by factors at the household level, of which socio-economic factors are most important. And the result also indicated that, in the cities schooling decisions are hardly influenced by supply-side factors. In rural areas, however, these factors do play an important role. If there are fewer schools or teachers, or if the local culture is more patriarchal, rural children (in particular girls) participate substantially less. The major finding of this respect was that in rural areas inequalities between socio-economic status groups are lower if more school and teachers are available. It has been found that socio-economic indices like the characteristics of households, parental income, wealth, education and occupation, have long been known to be major determinants of educational enrolment and achievement in both developing and developed countries. Source (*Journal of Hum& Soc. Science Stud, Voe-I, Issue-V, March 2015, Page No. 19-25 Pub. y Assam, India,*

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design as a method of collecting data by interviewing or administration of questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Kombo&Tromp, 2007). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) argue that survey research is a self-report study which requires the collection of quantifiable information from the sample. Survey is preferred because it involves gathering data that describes events and then organizes, tabulates, depicts and describes the data collection (Glass&Hopkins, 1984).Through this design the researcher were pose a series of questions to willing respondents; summaries their responses with percentages, frequency counts, and means, and draw conclusions. The design is also expected to save time and limited money.

To conduct the research both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies were employed. This was because employing the mixed approach help to converge or confirm findings from different data sources. So, this study were mainly employed by quantitative method and it were complemented by qualitative method .Quantitative methodology was used as a major method because of the nature of the study and the research questions. Due to the same reason descriptive survey research method was used to describe and explore the major causes of educational wastage in the nominated government 2nd level primary schools.

3.2. The Area of study

This study was conducted within randomly selected district of West Hararghe zone. West Hararghe is one of the zone administrations, located at the eastern part of Oromia regional state, in Ethiopia .The zone has 15woredas and 2 town administrative Counsels. Out of these woredas, Five (5) of them were randomly selected and 2 (two) town administrative had taken by quota system. According to WHZEO, Annual statistical Abstract (2009-2010), the dropout and repetitionratewere19.3, 17.9and8.4, 7.5respectively.So the researcher selects the zone because of high rate of drop-out and repetition of learners in government second level (5-8) primary schools. This had raised great concern among parents and stakeholders. Most economic activities

in the zone revolve around agriculture and trade. Agricultural activities include chat, coffee production, Maize, Sorgem farming and raring of animals. There are 905 government primary schools 562 of which are 2nd cycle (5-8) primary schools and twenty one (21) of them were proposed for the sample of the study. The same thing to the zonal education evidence made the school level dropout and repetition rate were seen a total percentage of 6.2, 5.98, 9.89, 7.2, and 6.3 dropout rate had exposed in the consecutive five years (2006-2010) respectively. On the other hand there were, 4.3, 4.8, 6.4, and 5.6 and, 4.1 repetition rate was shown in the same consecutive year respectively. So the percentage of dropout and repetition rate shown above noticed that, there were a great number of students' disparity from the school and held in the same class in the continuous year respectively.

3.3. Sources of Data

The necessary data for this study were collected from both primary and secondary source. The primary data were obtained from dropout and repeater students, teachers, principals and parents while the secondary data were obtained from statistical documents, roster and reports of zonal and woredas education office and the projected sample schools.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

This study were used both quantitative and qualitative data. The following data tools were employed to collect the data needs to the study. The data were gathered by the help of instruments namely, questionnaires, interview and document review. The questionnaire was consisted of closed-ended questioning type, so as to extract all the possible indicators of the problems of wastage in a school system. Then, a set of questionnaire were compiled and distributed to the sample schools that were randomly selected.

3.4.1. Questionnaires

A questionnaire is one of the most effective instruments commonly used for obtaining important information about the population in social science research (Mugenda, 1999, p-71)in this study, structured questionnaires were prepared for: the repeater and dropout students, teachers and head teachers with English and Afaan Oromo Language. The questionnaire is preferred because it saves time, and also because the respondents are all literate and hence able to respond to the items by their own. Each item in the questionnaire was developed aim at addressing a specific research question in the study. The questionnaire had two sections: I-with the sub parts of (A)for capturing data on background information of the respondents and section II- with the sub parts of (B,C,D)contains items seeking to determine the causes of school dropout and repetition among 2nd cycle primary school pupils i.e., Knowledge, attitude and opinion questionnaire. Nkapa (1997) posits that questionnaires are carefully designed instruments for collecting data in accordance with the specification of the research questions.

3.4.2. Interview guide

An interview guide was prepared for the principals and Parents in order to get their intrinsic idea, opinion and attitude about each specific research question.

3.5. Data collection procedures

The researcher were asked permission from the College of Education and Behavioral sciences research post graduate coordinating office, of Jimma University, and from west Hararghe zone educational office, before collecting data from respondents. The researcher then was taken questionnaires to the respondents. The date and time for collection filled questionnaires were agreed on link with the respondents. The instruments were given to the responds without further instructions other than those stated in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were collected at the agreed date and time respectively.

3.6. Population and sampling technique of the study

West Hararghe zone consists 15 woredas and 2 cities secretarial. Out of these 5 of them were selected by the random sampling technique and 2 cities administrations .were taken by quota

system. Also there are 562 II-level primary schools in the zone. Since, it is difficult to include all the school in the study, the researchers preferred to focus on sample schools. Accordingly random sampling technique was used to come up with the representative and manageable sample for the study. Out of the total 2nd cycle primary schools functioning in the zone, 21 of them were selected as a sample schools. In order to ensure fair representation of schools with different characteristics in the sample, all the 2nd level primary schools were stratified accordingly weather they are rural or urban. In addition to this, sample schools were classified in terms of their size and their location or distribution within the zone involved. The number of schools from each selected districts to be included in the sample were determined by the quota sampling technique. Finally the particular schools were selected on the basis of random sampling procedure.

3.7. Sample size and sampling procedure

To determine sample size and sampling procedures, the frame of sampling or population had been defined. Accordingly, the target population for this study was the people in 15 districts and 2 cities administrative people serve by 562 II- level primary schools of west Hararghe zone. Therefore the sampling people were the people in Five (5) woredas and the 2 town administrative people serve by selected twenty one (21) 2nd level primary schools. According to the recent zonal educational office statistical data (2010 E.C) there are a total number of 56 principals, 403 teachers in the sampling schools. However, 33(60%) principals and vice principals and 268(66.50%) of teachers were taken by the purposive and lottery method, whereas 171(100%) drop-outs and repeaters students were selected by snow-ball sampling method. The dropout students were invited from the school and PAs around the school. The 60(77.9%) parents were selected with purposive sampling methods and use them as respondents for this study.

Table 3.1 Distribution of Sample schools

Districts	No.Of Schools	Samples										
		Schools	Principals			Teachers			Dropouts students	Repeater Students	Total	Parents
			M	F	T	M	F	T				
Tulo	39	3	4	1	5	19	14	33	13	11	24	9
Gamech	40	3	4	0	4	27	14	41	10	10	20	9
Chiro town	6	4	7	2	9	25	32	57	11	20	31	9
Odabultum	41	3	3	0 -	3	18	19	37	8	6	14	9
Boke	25	4	6	0	6	27	13	40	26	18	44	12
Mi'esso		2	2	0	2	15	10	25	9	9	18	6
Bedessa	2	2	3	1	4	20	15	35	8	12	20	6
Total	153	21	29	4	33	151	117	268	85	86	171	60

3.8. Data Analysis techniques

Data analysis may be defined as a statistical method for data analysis so that they can be interpreted (Kerlinger, 1973). The researcher was perused the returned research instruments to sort them out. After which, the data were analyzed, using the quantitative and qualitative method. The researcher was interested in finding out whether school-based, student-related, and home-based factors would be related to educational wastage (dependent variable). The Percentage and frequency is used to analyze various characteristics of respondents. The weighted mean is used to identify which of the item is rated above average mean score to be considered as one of the significant factors for high educational wastage of primary schools. The independent mean and percentage were employed to test the respondents (teachers and students) degree of agreement regarding the important reasons for educational wastage. Data collected through different instruments were coded and tabulated. The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS

versions²⁰.The t-test of significance of respondent's opinion difference was measured at alpha level 0.05.The analysis of data was involved by descriptive statistics such as, mean, percentage and frequency were used, for summarization and reduction of the data which is collected from the research.

3.9. Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that issues concerning research subjects were observed. In data collection, analysis and presentation, the researcher maintains integrity. For this reason, before the data was collected, permission was asked to carry out research from the university and zonal Educational office during data collection. The researcher that the confidentiality of the respondents was protected by keeping information gave confidential. The researcher also ensured that no physical harm was caused on respondents and that learning was not disrupted. The researcher made it clear to the respondents that the process is an evaluation of the factors influencing educational wastage in west Hararghe zone .The respondents were assured that the outcome of the study is directly beneficial to them, as the findings were be freely accessed at Jimma University.

CHAPTER-FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of the research was to investigate the cause of educational wastage in the government 2nd cycle primary schools: in the case of west Hararghe zone. This chapter presents the findings of the study and their interpretations through analysis of data gathered in the form of questionnaire, interview from sample respondents and related documents. It is alienated in to three parts where the first part deals with the characteristics of respondents while the second part presents analysis of responses from principals, teachers, students and parents. The third part deals with analysis of data collected from documents to show the trends in internal efficiency. So, in order to answer the research questions, this chapter is organized as follows. Analyzed characteristics of respondents, factors that favor students to dropout in the school, factors that favor students to repeat grade in school, respondent's belief towards the problem of internal efficiency and respondents attitude on the mechanisms that help to improve repetition or dropout the schools

4.1. Characteristics and Backgrounds of Respondents

Total of 472 questionnaires were distributed to 33 primary schools principals, 171 students who were attending grades 5 to 8 and to 268 teachers. From the totally 472 questionnaires were distributed to respondents 472(100%) were completed and returned. Of these respondents principals and students 'were completed 100% while the teachers 'were done 99.6% and 1.4% of teachers were not. The parents were participated on the interview and their response was organized in the form of interview note. In such a way that the number of questionnaires returned were sufficient enough to continue the study. The illustration in this regard is shown in the table below.

Table 4.1-Description of Principals and Teachers Respondents

No	Item	Level	Principals		Teachers		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	29	87.87	151	56.3	180	72.1
		Female	4	12.13	117	43.7	121	55.83
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100
2	Age	20-30	13	39.4	104	38.8	117	39.1
		31-40	17	51.5	97	36.2	114	43.85
		41-50	1	3	56	20.9	57	11.95
		51-60	2	6.1	11	4.1	13	5.1
3	Qualification	Diploma	10	30.3	166	61.9	176	46.1
		BA/BSC	23	69.7	102	38.1	125	53.9
4	Service in current school	1-10	27	81.8	207	77.23	234	77.74
		11-20	5	15.22	41	15.3	46	15.3
		>20	1	3.0	20	7.5	21	7.0
5	Total work experience	1-10	8	24.24	94	35.1	102	29.67
		11-20	21	63.63	110	41.04	131	52.36
		>20	4	12.12	64	23.9	68	18.01
6	Specialization	EDPM	7	21.2	-	-	7	21.2
		PGDSCL	7	21.2	-	-	7	21.2
		Indirect Course	19	57.6	-	-	19	57.6
7	Teachers position beside teaching work	Dep/Head	-	-	58	21.6	58	21.6
		Ho/R/Teacher	-	-	151	56.3	151	56.3
		Ped/Center	-	-	17	6.3	17	6.3
		Mentor	-	-	25	9.3	25	9.3
		Other	-	-	17	6.3	17	6.3

Principals and Teachers, %= Percentage, N=number

As table 1, indicates that, of the total 532 respondents, 33 (6.20%) were principals and 268 (50.37%) were teachers.

Concerning sex distribution of the respondents, the finding indicates that, the participation of Women in the leadership of the schools and in the teaching work were not as if it is expected to more than or equivalent to the males.

In terms of age distribution, this finding demonstrates that the managerial and leadership functions of the schools were not represented with the young age and the majority of the teachers were between 20 to 40 years.

Concerning the educational qualifications of the respondents, the result indicates that, the 2nd cycle primary education is not sprint with the essential qualified man power as the setting standards of the level.

Regarding gross working experience, the result indicated that, the majority of the principals and teachers in the sample schools have had high service years. This show the schools have an opportunity to run exposure exchange regarding instructional process and high chance for mentis that closely to get an access of mentors.

Concerning their work experience of the respondents in current school indicated that, majority of respondent working experience in current school is very low. These findings shows that there were high teachers and school principals turn over from school to school or to other sectors. Regarding area of specialization the table indicated that, 21.2% of the principals were specialized with EDPM. 21.2%of the school principals were specialized with PGDSCL and the majorities 57.6%of the school principals have not taken the course. In this case, the findings show that most of the samples schools were guided by the directors which have not taken the course.

Concerning the position of teachers beside the teaching work, the table show that, the majority 56.3% of the teachers respondents were homeroom teacher.21.6%ofthe teachers were the heads of departments, the9.3%of them were mentor, 6.3%of the teachers were the heads of pedagogical center and the rest 6.3% had other extra work. This show that, how teachers had accompanied by many works in the school beside the teaching work.

Table 4.2 Description of student respondents

S/level	Am	Items											
		Respondents		Location		Sex		Age		Grade level			
		Drop.	Rep.	Rural	Town	M	F	11-15	16-20	G-5	G-6	G-7	G-8
5-8	N	85	86	90	75	95	76	121	50	12	43	58	58
	%	49.7	50.3	56	44	56	44	70.8	29.2	7	25	34	34

As the table indicates that, of the total 532 total respondents 32.14% were students. Of the total student respondents' 49.7% weredropouts and 50.3% were repeaters.

In terms of age distribution, most of the student respondents were in the age group of 11to15years, the rest fewer respondents were between16to20years respectively. Therefore, the events indicate that, the majority of the dropout and the repeater participants were at the school age level. The rest indicates that, beyond the school age of the elementary education.

Regarding students respondent grade level,70%of the participants were 5th grade students, 25.1%of them were 6th grade where as 33.9%of the students were 7th and 33.9% were 8th grade students. So the events indicate that, Most of the students respondents were matured enough and could express themselves properly.

Table 4.3Description of parent’s respondents

No. Of Resp.	Scale	Item									
		Location		Sex		Age		Qualification		Family members	
		R	T	M	F	20-40	41-60	1-8	9-10	1-5	≥6
60	N	60	0	49	11	45	15	46	14	51	9
	%	100	0	82	18	75	25	77	23	85	15

As table-3 indicates that, of the total 532 respondents 11.29% were parents. All of the parents were from the rural area. Of the 60parent respondents81.7%weremales whereas 18.3% were females respectively and this finding indicates that women participation was very low.

Relating to educational qualifications, (77%) of parent respondents has primary level (1-8) education qualification. Whereas (23%) of the parent respondents has secondary school (9-10) education. This finding indicates that, the parent respondents have the no how of education. Concerning parental position of parent respondent (71.7%) of them were fathers whereas (28.3%) of them were mothers respectively. The event demonstrates that the majority of parent respondent’s position in their family was father. Therefore, this indicates fathers are dominant in their family. On the other hand,(85%) of the parent respondent has 1to5 children’s and rest (15%) of them has 6 and above children’s in their family respectively. So this finding indicates that, the greater part of parent respondents seems to follow the family planning.

Table 4.4 Second cycle primary Education Dropout and Repetition rate in the Zone

Year	Grade	Enrolment			Dropout- rate			Repetition-rate			Promotion-rate		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
					%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2009	5-8	65915	41388	107303	15.9	22.7	19.3	7.8	9.1	8.4	76.3	68.2	72.3
2010	5-8	75419	45536	120955	14.8	21.0	17.9	6.8	8.3	7.5	78.4	70.7	74.5

(Source-WHZE0, Annual statistical Abstract 2009-2010E.C)

According to the data indicated on the table the dropout rate for second cycle primary school (5-8) shows little fluctuation means nearest to the same outcome. As a result analyzed in the year (2009) indicate that the dropout rate was, 15.3% male and 22.3% female and the total dropout rate of 19.3% respectively. So, this finding point out there was high dropout of learners from the school in both sexes but the females learner were insistent out of the school.

The dropout rate in the year (2010) indicates 14.8% males and 21.0% females and the total dropout rates of 17.9% respectively. This data show that, there were high dropouts in both sexes but the females were aggressively dropped out of the school. Therefore the events in the consecutive years indicate there were high dropouts of student in the second cycle primary schools of the zone. Especially female's student does suffer highly due to drop out.

On the other hand, 7.8% males, 9.1% females and total of (8.4%) repetition were indicated in the year 2009 respectively and 6.8% male and 8.3% female and the total of 7.5% of repetition rate were indicated respectively.

In the repetition case, in the year 2010, there was better handling the problem than in 2009 academic year. However in both years, the events show that, great numbers of students were detained. So, this indicates that there were high repetition problem in the second cycle primary schools in the zone; in particular female's students were highly victims of all.

Table 4.5- School based factors to learner's dropout respond by sch. principals and teachers

No	Items	Level	Respondents						No	Items	Lev	Respondents					
			Principals		Teachers		\Total					Principals		Teachers		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	M				N	%	N	%	N	M
1	Long distance from home to school	SA	8	24.2	55	20.5	63	22.5	4	Use of Corporal Punishment by the school Mgt.	SA	2	6.1	34	12.7	36	9.4
		Ag	14	42.4	107	39.9	121	41.15			Ag	7	21.2	74	27.6	81	24.4
		Und	4	12.1	32	11.9	36	12			Und	7	21.2	68	25.4	75	23.3
		DA	5	15.2	56	20.9	61	18.05			DA	12	36.4	60	22.4	72	29.4
		SDA	2	6.1	18	6.7	20	6.4			SDA	5	15.2	32	11.9	37	13.55
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100
2	Lack of educational materials	SA	8	24.2	49	18.3	57	21.25	5	Influence of peer groups	SA	2		53	19.8	55	12.9
		Ag	14	42.4	90	33.6	104	38			Ag	23	69.7	97	36.2	120	52.95
		Und	6	18.2	57	21.3	63	19.75			Und	7	21.2	63	23.5	70	22.35
		DA	5	12.5	50	18.7	55	15.6			DA	1	3	48	17.9	49	10.45
		SDA	0	0	16	6.0	16	6			SDA	0	0	7	2.6	7	2.6
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100
3	Shortage of school facilities	SA	5	15.2	62	23.1	67	19.15	6	Cultural impact/irritation	SA	6	18.2	48	17.6	54	18
		Ag	9	27.3	94	35.1	103	31.2			Ag	16	48.5	116	43.3	122	45.9
		Und	8	24.2	42	15.7	50	19.95			Und	5	15.2	30	11.2	35	13.2
		DA	7	21.2	47	17.5	54	19.35			DA	4	12.1	48	17.9	52	15
		SDA	4	12.1	23	8.6	27	10.35			SDA	2	6.1	26	9.7	28	7.9
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100

From the table, some lists of possible factors that force students to drop out of school were identified. Moreover, teachers and principal respondents were asked to rate these possible factors according to their perception each of the factors giving due attention. Therefore each of the factors was interpreted as follows.

Item-1 Long distance from home to school, toward this factor 24.2% of the principals and 20.5% teachers' respondents were indicated strongly agree, whereas as 42.4% of school principals and 39.9% of teachers were indicated Agree. On the other hand 12.1% of principals and 11.9% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 15.2% of the principals and the 20.9% of the teachers were rated disagree; whereas 6.1% of the principals and the 6.7% of the teachers were replied

strongly disagree. So the investigation result implies the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is the factor favors to students' dropout.

Item-2 Lack of educational materials, to this factor 24.2% of the principals and 18.3% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 42.4% of school principals and 33.3% of teachers were indicate Agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principals and 21.3% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.5% of the principals and the 18.7% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 0% of the principals and the 6.0% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is favor to students dropout.

Item-3-Shortage of school conveniences, to this factor 15.2% of the principals and 23.1% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 27.3% of school principals and 35.1% of teachers were indicating Agree. On the other hand 24.2% of principals and 15.7% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 21.2% of the principals and the 17.5% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 12.1% of the principals and the 8.6% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies more than half of teachers respondents were supporting the issue as it is favor to students dropout, while more than half of the school principals were indicating, it is not favor to the students school dropout.

Item-4-Use of corporal punishments by school managements, towards this factor 6.1% of the principals and 12.7% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 21.2% of school principals and 27.6% of teachers were indicate Agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 25.4% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 36.4% of the principals and the 22.4% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 15.2% of the principals and the 11.9% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that almost half of the school principals respondents were reacting the issue is favors to the students drop out, While high number of teachers were said this factor is not favor to students drop out in their school. And not undermined number of school principals and teachers were not deciding about the issues.

Item-5-Influence of peer groups, concerning this factor 6.0% of the principals and 19.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 67.7% of school principals and 36.2% of teachers were indicate Agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 23.5% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 3.0% of the principals and the 17.9% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 0% of the principals and the 2.6% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree.

So the analysis result implies the high percent's of teachers and most of school principals' respondents were reacting, the issue is highly favoring to students dropouts.

Item-6-Cultural impact/irritation, to this point 18.2% of the principals and 17.6% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 48.5% of school principals and 43.3% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principals and 11.2% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.1% of the principals and the 17.9% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 9.7% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies most of the school principals and teachers were indicating it is highly favor to students drop out.

The finding identify that, long distance from home to school, lack of educational materials, Influence of peer groups and cultural impacts were the school based factors favor to students dropouts, whereas lack of school facilities and use of corporal punishment were factors that influence students to dropout from the school.

These all on top of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to strongly agree, ranges of (9.4) to (22.5) and the percentage mean, (17.20) where as those responded agree, were ranges to (24.4) to (52.95) with the percentage mean of (38.93) respectively. The rated scale of undecided were rated ranges to the minimum percentage of (12.0) to the highest percentage of (23.30) and the total percentage mean of (18.43) respectively. The scale rated disagrees were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (10.45) to maximum of percentage (29.4) and the mean of (17.98) respectively. The scale rated to strongly disagree, was ranges the minimum percentage (2.6) to the maximum of (13.55) and the mean of (7.8) respectively. Therefore, (56.13) of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the factors that favor to the students drop out from the schools. On the other hand (18.43) of respondents were not decided to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas, (17.98) of them were responded as disagree and (7.8) were strongly disagree to the issue respectively. So that, less number of respondents were said the factors raised has not an influence to the students drop out form the schools. So that, this finding implies that, long distance from home to school, lack of educational materials, Influence of peer groups and cultural impacts were the school based factors that causes to students dropouts, whereas shortage of school facilities and use of corporal punishment were factors that influence the students to dropout from the school.

Table 4.6 Learners related factors to students' dropout respond by school principals and teachers

No	Items	Level	Respondents						No	Item	Level	Respondents					
			Principals		Teachers		Total					Principals		Teachers		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	M				N	%	N	%	N	M
1	Students lack of interest in their learning	SA	5	15.2	71	26.5	76	20.85	4	Students need to trade chat	SA	16	48.5	105	39.2	121	43.85
		Ag	14	42.4	109	40.7	123	41.55			Ag	8	24.2	87	32.5	95	28.35
		Und	5	15.2	28	10.7	33	12.95			Und	3	9.1	30	11.2	33	10.15
		DA	7	21.2	43	16	50	18.6			D/A	5	15.2	30	11.2	35	13.2
		SDA	2	6.1	17	6.3	19	6.2			SDA	1	3	16	6	17	4.5
2	Poor academic performance	SA	4	12.1	33	12.3	37	12.2	5	Frustration during examination	SA	2	6.1	44	16.4	46	11.25
		Ag	14	42.4	129	48.3	143	45.35			Ag	11	33.3	83	31	94	32.15
		Und	9	27.3	46	17.2	55	22.25			Und	12	36.4	56	20.9	68	28.65
		DA	5	15.2	50	18.7	55	16.95			DA	6	18.2	63	23.5	69	20.85
		SDA	1	3.0	10	3.7	11	3.35			SDA	2	6.1	22	8.2	24	7.15
3	Frequent absenteeism.	SA	5	15.2	48	17.9	53	16.55	6	Students frequent repetition	SA	3	9.1	42	15.7	45	12.4
		Ag	12	36.4	98	36.5	110	36.45			Ag	15	45.5	78	29.1	93	37.3
		Und	9	27.3	58	21.6	67	24.45			Und	8	24.2	67	25	75	24.6
		DA	5	15.2	50	18.7	55	16.95			DA	4	12.1	66	24.6	70	18.35
		SDA	2	6.1	14	5.2	16	5.65			SDA	3	9.1	15	5.6	18	7.35

SA=Strongly Agree,Ag=Agree,Und=Undecided, A=Disagree,SDA=Strongly disagree

From the table some lists of possible factors that force students to drop out of school were identified. Moreover, teachers and principal respondents were asked to rate these possible factors according to their perception. Then each of the factors was interpreted as follows.

Item-1-Students lack of interest in their learning, concerning to this factor 15.2% of the principals and 26.5% teachers' respondents were indicated strongly agree. Whereas 42.4% of school principals and 40.7% of teachers were indicated Agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principals and 10.7% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 21.2% of the principals and the 16.0% of the teachers were rated disagree; whereas 6.1% of the principals and the 6.3% of the teachers were replied strongly disagree. So the investigation result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is the causes of students' dropout.

Item-2-Poor academic Performance, regarding to this factor 12.1% of the principals and 12.3% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree ,whereas 42.4%of school principals and 48.3% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principals and 17.2%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 15.2%of the principals and the 18.7%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as3.0%of the principals and the 3.7 %of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is favor to students dropout, but high percent of principals and teachers respondents were not deciding. So this confirms that, there is a dilemma of information.

Item-3- Students frequent absenteeism, to this factor 15.2% of the principals and 17.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 36.4%of school principals and 36.5% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principals and 21.6%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 15.2%of the principals and the 18.7%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as6.1%of the principals and the 5.2%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the more than half of teachers and school principal's respondents were supporting the issue as it is favor to student's dropout. But 27.3% percent of principals and 21.6%of teachers were indicating, not deciding. So this shows that, there is burier of information.

Item-4-Students need to trade chat; concerning to this factor 48.5% of the principals and 39.2% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 24.2%of school principals and 32.5% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 9.1% of principals and 11.2%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 15.2%of the principals and the 11.2%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as3.0%of the principals and the 6.0%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, more than 70%of teachers and school principals' respondents were reacting that, the issue is favors to the students drop out of the area.

Item-5-Furustration during the examination, concerning to this factor 6.1% of the principals and16.4% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 33.3%of school principals and 31% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 36.4% of principals and 20.9%of teachers were not deciding their option. The18.2%of the principals and the23.5%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as6.1%of the principals and the 8.2%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, more than half of teachers and school principals' respondents were reacting the issue is not favor to students drop out of the target area.

Item-6-Students frequent repetition, concerning to this factor 9.1% of the principals and 15.7% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 45.5% of school principals and 29.1% of teachers were indicate Agree. On the other hand 24.2% of principals and 25.0% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.1% of the principals and the 24.6% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 9.1% of the principals and the 5.6% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that more than half of the school principals were indicating it is the causes of the dropouts and the teachers respondents were demonstrate not favor to students drop out of the target area.

These findings identified that, student's lack of interest in their learning, students poor academic performance, student's frequent absenteeism and student's needs to trade chat were the learners based causes of dropouts, whereas students frequent repetition and frustrations during examination are pupils based factors that influence students to dropout from the school.

These all on top of mentioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to strongly agree, ranges of (11.25) to (43.85) and the percentage mean, (19.52) where as those responded agree, were ranges to (28.35) to (45.35) with the percentage mean of (36.84) respectively. The rated scale of undecided were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (10.15) to the highest percentage of (28.65) and the percentage mean of (20.51) respectively. The scale rated disagrees were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (13.2) to the maximum percentage of (20.85) and the mean of (17.5) respectively. Those who were rated strongly disagree, was ranges the minimum percentage of 3.35 to 7.35 highest percentage, and the mean of (5.7) respectively. Therefore, the 56.36 of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the factors that favored to the students drop out from the schools. Especially the highly stressed factors to the students drop out by almost all respondents were "the students need to trade chat". On the other said (18.33%) of respondents were undecided to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas, (17.50) of them were responded as disagree and (7.5) were strongly disagree respectively. So that, the less number of respondents were said the factors raised has not favored to the students drop out form the school. These findings pointed that, students lack of interest in their learning, Students poor academic performance, Students frequent absenteeism and Students needs to trade chat were learners based causes of students drop out of the target area ,whereas students frequent repetition and frustration during examination were indicated as pupils based factors that influence students to dropout from the school.

Table 4.7- parent based factors to learner's dropout respond by school principals and teachers

No	Items	Scale	Respondents						No	Items	Scale	Respondents					
			Principals		Teachers		Total					Principals		Teachers		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	M				N	%	N	%	N	M
1	Lack of parental encouragement	SA	8	24.3	65	24.3	73	24.3	4	Family stop working	SA	4	12.1	41	15.3	45	13.7
		Ag	10	30.3	107	39.9	117	35.1			Ag	13	39.4	103	38.4	116	38.9
		Und	7	21.2	46	17.2	53	19.2			Und	11	33.3	58	21.6	69	27.45
		DA	5	15.2	34	12.7	39	13.95			DA	4	12.1	49	18.3	53	15.2
		SDA	3	9.1	16	6.0	19	7.55			SDA	1	3	17	6.3	18	4.65
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100
2	Families Lower standards of living	SA	8	24.2	55	20.5	63	22.35	5	Parental illness or death	SA	5	15.2	46	17.2	51	16.2
		Ag	12	36.4	117	43.7	129	40.05			Ag	15	45.5	89	33.2	104	39.35
		Und	7	21.2	61	22.8	68	22			Und	4	12.1	63	23.5	67	17.80
		DA	7	12.1	20	7.5	24	9.8			DA	6	18.2	54	20.1	60	19.15
		SDA	2	6.1	15	5.6	17	5.85			SDA	3	9.1	16	6	19	7.55
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100
3	Involve ment in family work	SA	10	30.3	48	17.9	58	24.1	6	Unsafe road condition from home to school.	SA	5	15.2	52	19.4	57	17.3
		Ag	11	33.3	95	35.4	106	34.35			Ag	11	33.3	67	25	78	29.15
		Und	9	27.3	63	23.5	72	25.4			UND	7	21.2	54	20.1	61	20.65
		DA	2	6.1	48	17.9	50	12			DA	4	12	76	28.4	80	20.2
		SDA	1	3.0	14	5.2	15	4.1			SDA	6	18.2	19	7.1	25	12.65
		Total	33	100	268	100	301	100			Total	33	100	268	100	301	100

SA=Strongly Agree,Ag=Agreement=Undecided, A=Disagree, SDA=Strongly disagree

From the table some lists of possible factors that force students to drop out of school were identified. Moreover, teachers and principal respondents were asked to rate these possible factors according to their perception each of the factors giving due attention. Then each factor was interpreted as below.

Item-1-Lack of parental encouragement of the Students, concerning to this factor 24.3% of the principals and 24.3% teachers' respondents were indicated strongly agree, whereas 30.3% of school principals and 39.9% of teachers were indicated agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 17.2% of teachers were not deciding the option. The 15.2% of the principals and the 12.7% of the teachers were rated disagree; whereas 9.1% of the principals and the 6.0% of the

teachers were replied strongly disagree. So the investigation result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is favored to the students' dropout.

Item-2-Families lower standards of living, concerning to this factor 24.3% of the principals and 20.5% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 36.4% of school principals and 43.7% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 22.8% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.1% of the principals and the 7.5% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 7.5 % of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue is favor to students dropout. However, 21.2 percent of principals and 22.8 teacher's respondents were not deciding the option. So this confirms that, there is a dilemma of information.

Item.3-Involvement in family work, concerning to this factor 30.3% of the principals and 17.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 33.3% of school principals and 35.4% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principals and 23.5% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 6.1% of the principals and the 17.9% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 3.0% of the principals and the 5.2% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the more than half of teachers and school principal's respondents were supporting the issue as it is favor to student's dropout. But 27.3% of principals and 23.5% of teachers were indicating, not deciding. So this shows that, there is burier of information.

Item.4-Families stop working, regarding this factor, 12.1% of the principals and 15.3% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 39.4% of school principals and 38.4% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 33.3% of principals and 21.1% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.1% of the principals and the 18.3% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 3.0% of the principals and the 6.3% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, almost half of teachers and school principals' respondents were reacting that, the issue is favors to the students drop out of the area.

Item.5-Parental illness or death, concerning to this factor 15.2% of the principals and 17.2% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 45.5% of school principals and 33.2% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 12.1% of principals and 23.5% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 18.2% of the principals and the 20.1% of the teachers were rate

disagree; where as 9.1% of the principals and the 6.0% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, more than half of teachers and school principals' respondents were reacting the issue is favor to students drop out of the target area.

Item.6-Unsafe road condition from home to school, concerning to this issue 15.2% of the principals and 19.4% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 33.3% of school principals and 25% of teachers were indicate agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 20.1% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.0% of the principals and the 28.4% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 18.2% of the principals and the 7.1% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were not supporting to the factor favor to students dropouts of the target area. This finding identified that, lack of parental encouragements of the students, families lower standards of living, Involvement in family work, Parental illness or death, were the parents or home based factors favors to dropouts of the students, whereas families stop working and unsafe road condition from home to school, are indicated as the factors that influence students to dropout.

These all on pinnacle of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to strongly agree, ranges of (13.7) to (24.30) and the percentage mean, (19.66) where as those responded agree, were ranges to (29.15) to (40.1) with the percentage mean of (36.15) respectively. The rated scale of undecided were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (17.80) to the highest percentage of (27.54) and with the total percentage mean of (22.08) respectively. The scales rated disagree were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (9.8) to maximum percentage (20.2) and the mean of (15.05) respectively. Those who were rated strongly disagree, was ranges, to minimum percentage of (4.10) to (12.65) highest percentage, and the mean of (7.1) respectively. Therefore, the 55.81 mean percentage of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the factors that favored to the students drop out from the schools. Especially the highly stressed factors to the students drop out by high number of respondents were "the student's family lower standards of living". On the other said (22.08) of respondents were rated not decided to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas, (22.15) of them were responded as disagree and strongly disagree respectively. These imply that, less number of respondents was said the factors raised have not favored to the students drop out form the schools. So, these finding indicating that, lack of parental encouragements of the students, families lower standards of living, involvement in family work and parental illness or death, are

the home based factors causes to dropouts of the students, whereas families stop working and unsafe road condition from home to school, were indicated as the factors that influence students to dropout.

Table 4.8-School based factors to learners dropout respond by dropout students

No	Items	Level	Respondents		No	Items	Level	Respondents	
			Dropout Students					Dropout Students	
			N	%				N	%
1	Long distance from home to school	VI	36	42.4	4	Use of Corporal Punishment by the school Mgt.	VI	17	20
		I	16	18.8			I	11	12.9
		NI	34	38.8			NI	58	67.1
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
2	Lack of educational materials	VI	27	31.8	5	Influence of peer groups	VI	29	34.1
		I	30	35.3			I	25	29.4
		NI	29	32.9			NI	32	36.5
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
3	Shortage of school facilities	VI	23	27.1	6	Cultural impact/irritation	VI	14	16.5
		I	27	31.8			I	17	20
		NI	36	41.1			NI	55	63.5
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100

VI=Very Important, I=Important, NI=Not Important

All these mentioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to Very Important, ranges (16.5) to(42.4) and the percentage mean of(28.65) where as those responded Important, were ranges to(12.9) to(35.3)with the percentage mean of(24.7)respectively. The rated scale of not Important were ranges to the minimum percentage of (32.9) to the highest percentage of(67.1) and the total percentage mean of (46.7)respectively. Therefore, (53.4) of respondents were voted Very Important and Important to the factors raised favor to the students drop out from the schools. On the other hand (46.7) of respondents were voted not Important to the factors raised favor to the students dropout. So, this finding implies that, the school based factors such that, long distance from home to school, lack of educational materials, shortage of school facilities and Influence of peer groups are the school based factors that causes to students dropouts, whereas use of corporal punishment and cultural impact/irritation were factors that influence the students to dropout from the school.

Table 4.9- Parent related factors to learner’s dropout respond by dropout student

No	Items	Level	Respondents		No	Items	Level	Respondents	
			Dropout Students					Dropout students	
			N	%				N	%
1	Lackof parental encouragement	VI	28	32.9	4	Families stop working	VI	26	30.6
		I	30	35.3			I	22	25.9
		NI	28	31.8			NI	38	43.5
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
2	Families lower standards of living	VI	30	34.9	5	Parental illness or death	VI	17	.20
		I	22	25.6			I	11	12.9
		NI	34	39.5			NI	58	67.1
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
3	Involve ment in family work	VI	29	34.1	6	Un safe road condition from home to school	VI	18	21.2
		I	25	29.4			I	26	30.6
		NI	32	36.5			NI	42	48.2
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100

VI=Very Important, I=Important, NI=Not important

These all on summit of parental based factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to Very Important, ranges from (20) to(34.9) and the percentage mean,(28.95) where as those responded Important, were ranges to(12.9) to(35.3)with the percentage mean of(26.62)respectively The rated scale of not Important were rated ranges to the minimum percentage of (31.8) to the highest percentage of(67.1) and the total percentage mean of (44.43)respectively. Therefore, (55.6) of respondents were rated Very Important and Important to the raised factors were favor to the students drop out from the schools. On the other hand (44.43) of respondents rated the factors were not important to favor the students dropout. So, this finding implies that, lack of parental encouragement, families’ lower standard of living and involvement of students in family work, were the factors causes to students dropouts, whereas families stop working, parental illness or death and unsafe road condition to the school, were factors that influence the students to dropout from the school.

Table 4.10 Learner based factors to school dropout respond by dropout students

No	Items	Level	Respondents		No	Items	Level	Respondents	
			Dropout Students					Dropout Students	
			N	%				N	%
1	Students gave lesser attention to their learning	VI	18	21.2	4	Students needs to trade chat	VI	18	21.2
		I	17	20.0			I	28	32.9
		NI	51	58.8			NI	40	45.9
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
2	Poor academic performance	VI	7	8.2	5	Frustration during examination	VI	18	21.2
		I	16	18.8			I	15	17.6
		NI	63	73			NI	53	61.2
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
3	Frequent absenteeism	VI	27	31.8	6	Students frequent repetition	VI	9	10.6
		I	26	30.6			I	20	23.5
		NI	33	37.6			NI	57	65.9
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100

VI=Very Important, I= Important, NI=Not Important

These all learners based factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to Very Important, ranges from (8.2) to(31.8)and the percentage mean,(19.03) where as those responded Important, were ranges to(17.6) to(32.9)and the percentage mean of(23.9)respectively The rated scale of Not Important were rated ranges to the minimum percentage of (37.6) to the highest percentage of(73) and the percentage mean of (57.06)respectively. Therefore, (42.93%) of respondents were rated Very Important and Important to the factors that favor to the students dropping out from the schools. On the other hand (57.1%) of respondents were not important to the factors favored to the students dropouts.

So, this finding implies that, students frequent absenteeism and students' needs to trade chat were the school based factors that causes to students dropouts, whereas students gave lesser attention to their learning, poor academic performance, frustration during examination and student's frequent repetition were the factors that influence the students to dropout from the school.

Table 4.11 School based factors to student’s repetition respond by principals and teachers

No	Items	Res	Level											
			S/Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		S/disagree		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	High student section ration	P	10	30.3	15	45.5	4	12.1	3	9.1	1	3.0	33	100
		T	73	27.2	107	39.9	33	12.3	37	13.8	18	6.7	268	100
		M	83	28.8	122	42.7	37	12.2	40	11.45	19	4.85	301	100
2	Poor infrastructure of the school	P	5	15.2	16	48.5	7	21.2	4	12.1	1	3.0	33	100
		T	48	17.9	118	44.0	47	17.5	43	16.0	12	4.5	268	100
		M	53	16.6	134	46.25	54	19.4	47	14.05	13	3.8	301	100
3	Difficulty of language of instruction	P	6	18.2	8	24.2	4	12.1	10	30.3	5	15.2	33	100
		T	58	21.6	62	23.1	50	18.7	62	23.1	36	13.4	268	100
		M	64	19.9	70	23.65	54	15.4	72	26.7	41	14.3	301	100
4	Inappropriateness of the school environment	P	4	12.1	20	60.6	6	18.2	3	9.1	0	0	33	100
		T	45	16.8	90	33.6	59	22.0	64	23.1	10	3.7	268	100
		M	49	14.5	110	47.1	65	20.1	67	16.1	10	1.85	301	100
5	Lack of text books	P	6	18.2	12	36.4	5	15.2	6	18.2	4	12.1	33	100
		T	68	25.4	105	39.2	39	14.6	41	15.3	15	5.6	268	100
		M	74	21.8	117	37.8	44	14.9	47	16.75	19	8.85	301	100
6	Poor involvement of the community in the school	P	8	24.2	18	54.5	5	15.2	2	6.1	0	0	33	100
		T	55	20.5	96	35.8	49	18.3	55	20.5	13	4.9	268	100
		M	36	22.35	114	45.15	54	16.7	57	13.3	13	2.45	301	100
7	Lack of experienced teachers	P	7	21.2	9	27.3	8	24.2	6	18.2	3	9.1	33	100
		T	58	21.6	77	28.7	35	13.1	69	25.7	29	10.8	268	100
		M	65	21.4	86	28	43	18.7	75	21.95	32	9.95	301	100
8	Absence of instructional supervisions supports	P	4	12.1	14	42.4	6	18.4	4	12.1	5	15.2	33	100
		T	52	19.4	117	43.7	38	14.2	47	17.5	47	5.2	268	100
		M	56	15.8	131	43.05	44	16.3	51	14.6	19	10.2	301	100
9	Lack of counseling service	P	1	3	13	39.4	9	27.3	8	24.2	2	6.1	33	100
		T	52	19.4	88	32	58	21.6	52	19.4	18	6.7	268	100
		M	53	11.2	101	35.7	67	24.45	60	21.8	20	6.4	301	100
10	Content loaded curriculum	P	5	15.2	16	48.5	5	15.2	7	21.2	0	0	33	100
		T	53	19.8	95	35.4	48	17.9	54	20.1	18	6.7	268	100
		M	58	17.5	111	41.95	53	16.55	61	20.65	18	3.35	301	100
11	Poor Mgt. of school based student academic support	P	5	15.2	12	36.4	6	18.2	8	24.2	2	6.1	33	100
		T	72	26.9	99	36.9	34	12.7	45	16.8	18	6.7	268	100
		M	77	21.1	111	36.7	40	15.45	53	20.5	20	6.4	301	100
12	Bad working environment due to poor conflict Mgt. of school,	P	2	6.1	8	24.2	9	27.3	8	24.2	6	18.2	33	100
		T	46	17.2	81	30.2	43	16	70	26.6	28	10.4	268	100
		M	48	11.7	89	27.2	52	21.65	78	25.4	34	14.3	301	100

As the table indicates some lists of possible factors that force students for repetition were identifying. Moreover, teachers and principal respondents were asked to rate these possible factors according to their perception to each of the factors giving due attention. Then each factor was interpreted as below.

Item.1-HighStudents section ratio, concerning to this factor, 30.3% of the principals and 27.2% of teachers' respondents were indicated strongly agree; whereas 45.5%of school principals and 39.9% of teachers were indicated agree. On the other hand 12.1% of principals and 12.3%of teachers were not deciding the option. The 9.1% of the principals and the 13.8%of the teachers were rated disagree; where as3.0%of the principals and the 6.7%of the teachers were replied strongly disagree. So the investigation result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting the issue, as it is favored to the students' dropout.

Item.2-Poor infrastructure of the schools, concerning to this factor 15.2% of the principals and 17.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 48.5%of school principals and 44.0% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principals and 17.5%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 12.1%of the principals and the 16.0%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as3.0%of the principals and the 4.5 %of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting, the issue is favor to student's repetition. However, 21.2 percent of principals and 17.5 percent of teacher respondents were not deciding the option. So this confirms that, there is a burier of information.

Item.3-Difficulty of language of instruction-concerning to this factor 18.2% of the principals and21.6% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 24.2%of school principals and 23.1% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 12.1% of principals and 18.7%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 30.3%of the principals and the 23.1% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 15.2% of the principals and the 13.4%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, 42.4 percent teachers and 44.7 percent of the school principals respondents were supporting, the issue is favor to students dropout. But the 45.5 percent of principals and 36.5% of teachers were indicating not. So this finding shows that, there is a problem of language of instruction, whereas the numbers nearest to them have shown not the causes of repetition.

Item.4-Lack of text book, regarding this factor,18.2% of the principals and 25.4% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 36.4%of school principals and 39.2% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principals and 14.6%of teachers were not deciding their option. The18.2%of the principals and the 15.3%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as12.1%of the principals and the5.6%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals' respondents were reacting the issue is favors to the students repetition.

Item.5-Inappropriatness of school environment for instructional program, concerning to this factor 12.1% of the principals and16.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 60.6%of school principals and 33.6% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principals and 22.0%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 9.1%of the principals and the23.1%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as0%of the principals and the 3.7%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the analysis result implies that, the high number of school principals' respondents were reacting, the issue is favor to the students to redundant the same class, whereas high number of teachers were say not.

Item.6-Poor involvement of parents and community in the school, concerning to this issue,24.2% of the principals and 20.5% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree,whereas54.5%of school principals and 35.8% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principals and 18.3%of teachers were not deciding their option. The 6.1%of the principals and the20.5%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 0% of the principals and the 4.9%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were supporting, the factor is favor the student's repetition, of the target area.

Item.7-Lackof experienced teachers, concerning to this issue,21.2% of the principals and 21.6% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree,whereas27.3%of school principals and 28.7% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand24.2% of principals and 13.1%of teachers were not deciding their option.The18.2%of the principals and the25.7%of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 9.1% of the principals and the 10.8%of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were supporting, the factor is favor the students repetition, where as 24.2 percent of the school principals were not deciding.

Item.8-Poor practice of instructional supervision supports, concerning to this issue, 12.1% of the principals and 19.4% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 42.4% of school principals and 43.7% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principals and 14.2% of teachers was not deciding their option. The 12.1% of the principals and the 17.5% of the teachers were rate disagreeing; where as 15.2% of the principals and the 5.2% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were supporting, the factor is favor the student's repetition, whereas the rest says not.

Item.9-Lack of counseling service, concerning to this issue, 3% of the principal's and 19.4% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 39.4% of school principals and 32.8% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principal's and 21.6% of teachers was not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 19.4% of the teachers were rate disagreeing; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 6.7% of the teachers were replies strongly disagree. So the result implies almost half of the teachers were supporting, the factor is favor the students repetition, whereas the rest says not.

Item.10-Content loaded curriculum, concerning to this issue, 15.2% of the principal's and 19.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 48.5% of school principals and 35.4% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principal's and 17.9% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 21.2% of the principals and the 20.1% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 0% of the principals and the 6.7% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the teachers and principals were supporting, the factor is favoring the student's repetition, whereas the rest says not.

Item.11-Poor management of school based students' academic support program, concerning to this issue, 15.2% of the principals and 26.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 36.4% of school principals and 36.9% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principal's and 12.7% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 16.8% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 6.7% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the teachers and principals were supporting, the factor is favoring the student's repetition, whereas the rest says not.

Item.12-Bad working environment due to poor conflict management of the school, concerning this issue, 6.1% of the principals and 17.2% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 24.2% of school principals and 30.2% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principal's and 16% of teachers was not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 26.6% of the teachers were rate disagreeing; where as 18.2% of the principals and the 10.4% of the teachers were replies strongly disagree. So the result implies almost half of the teachers and principal's respondents were not supporting, the factor is favoring the student's repetition, while half of the teachers were saying yes.

This finding identified that, High students section ratio, Poor infrastructure of the schools, Lack of text book, Poor involvement of parents and community in the school, Lack of experienced teachers, Poor practice of instructional supervision supports, Content loaded curriculum, Poor management of school based students' academic support program, are the school based factors causes to the students repetition, whereas difficulty of language of instruction, In appropriateness of school environment for the instructional program, Lack of counseling service, and Bad working environment due to poor conflict Mgt. of the school are indicated as the factors that influence students to redundant the same grade.

These all on pinnacle of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to strongly agree, ranges of (11.2) to (288) and the percentage mean, (18.6) where as those responded agree, were ranges to (23.65) to (47.1) with the percentage mean of (37.94) respectively. The rated scale of undecided were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (12.2) to the highest percentage of (24.45) and with the total percentage mean of (17.65) respectively. The scales rated disagree were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (11.45) to maximum percentage (26.7) and the mean of (18.60) respectively. Those who were rated strongly disagree, was ranges, to minimum percentage of (1.85) to (14.3) highest percentage, and the mean of (7.23) respectively. Therefore, the 56.54 mean percentage of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the School based factors that causes to the students repetition in the same grade. Especially the highly stressed factors to the students repetition indicated by high percent of respondents were "high students section ratio, lack of text books and poor practice of instructional supervision support are indicated as the main cases of repetition. On the other said (17.65) mean percentage of respondents were rated not decided to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas, (25.83) of them were responded as

disagree and strongly disagree respectively. These votes imply that, less number of respondents indicated that, the factors raised were not favored to the student's repetition.

Table 4.12 The instruction related factors to the student's repetition respond by principals and teachers

No	Items	R e s	Level											
			S/Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		S/disagree		Total	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	More of teacher centered teaching approach practice	p	11	33.3	14	42.4	5	15.2	2	6.1	1	3.0	33	100
		t	41	15.3	88	32.8	71	26.5	49	18.3	19	7.1	268	100
		M	52	19.3	102	37.6	76	20.85	51	12.2	20	5.05	301	100
2	Poor classroom Mgt. of teachers	p	7	21.2	15	45.5	3	9.1	6	18.2	2	6.1	33	100
		t	40	14.9	100	37.3	47	17.5	62	23.1	19	7.1	268	100
		M	47	18.1	115	41.4	50	13.3	68	20.65	21	6.6	301	100
3	Poor teachers extra support to the student	p	3	9.1	9	27.3	12	36.4	8	24.2	1	3.0	33	100
		t	48	17.9	77	28.7	63	23.5	45	16.8	35	13.1	268	100
		M	51	13.5	86	28	75	29.95	53	20.5	36	8.05	301	100
4	Inappropriate relationship of teachers with pupils	p	3	9.1	10	30.3	12	36.4	3	9.1	5	15.2	33	100
		t	51	19	84	31.3	50	18.7	61	22.8	22	8.2	268	100
		M	54	14.1	94	30.8	62	27.6	64	15.95	27	11.7	301	100
5	Poor usage of teaching aid materials	p	8	24.2	13	39.4	7	21.2	5	15.2	0	0	33	100
		t	37	13.8	84	31.3	61	22.8	48	17.9	30	11.9	268	100
		M	45	19	97	35.4	68	22	53	16.6	30	6	301	100
6	Poor usage of local specific examples	p	5	15.2	15	54.5	6	18.2	5	15.2	2	6.1	33	100
		t	37	13.8	80	29.9	54	20.1	72	26	25	9.3	268	100
		M	42	14.5	95	42.2	60	19.15	77	20.6	27	7.7	301	100
7	Poor continuous assessment practice	p	9	27.3	10	30.3	4	12.1	8	24.2	2	6.1	33	100
		t	61	22.8	81	30.2	43	16	63	23.5	20	7.5	268	100
		M	70	25.1	91	30.3	47	14.1	71	23.9	22	6.8	301	100
8	Poor questioning skill of teachers	p	3	9.1	12	36.4	9	27.3	8	24.2	1	3	33	100
		t	50	18.7	72	26.9	56	20.9	65	24.3	25	9.3	268	100
		M	53	13.9	84	31.7	65	24.1	73	24.3	26	6.2	301	100
9	Unsuitable examination	p	1	3	18	54.5	6	18.2	8	24.2	1	3.0	33	100
		t	38	14.2	96	35.8	36	13.4	83	31	35	13.1	268	100
		M	39	8.6	114	45.2	42	15.8	91	27.6	36	8.05	301	100
10	Teachers frequent absenteeism	p	5	15.2	11	33.3	10	30.3	6	18.2	1	3	33	100
		t	33	12.3	83	31	51	19	73	27.8	28	10.4	268	100
		M	38	13.8	94	32.2	61	24.7	79	23	29	6.7	301	100

On the table indicating some lists of possible factors that forces students for repetition to the same class were identifying. Moreover, teachers and principal respondents were asked to rate these possible factors according to their perception to each of the factors giving due attention. Then each factor was interpreted as below.

Item.1-More of teacher centered teaching approach practice, concerning to this factor, 33.3% of the principals and 15.3% of teachers' respondents were indicated strongly agree. Whereas 42.4% of school principals and 32.8% of teachers were indicated agree. On the other hand 15.2% of principals and 26.5% of teachers were not deciding the option. The 6.1% of the principals and the 18.3% of the teachers were rated disagree; where as 3.0% of the principals and the 7.1% of the teachers were replied strongly disagree. So the investigation result implies that, the majority school principals were supporting the issue, as it is favored to the students' dropout, whereas more than half of teachers respondents indicated not the factor that causes repetition.

Item.2-Poor class room management of the teachers, concerning to this factor 21.2% of the principals and 14.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 45.5% of school principals and 37.3% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 9.1% of principals and 17.5% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 18.2% of the principals and the 23.1% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 7.1% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies that, the majority of teachers and school principals were supporting, the factor is favor to student's repetition.

Item.3-Poor extra support of teachers to students -concerning to this factor 9.1% of the principals and 17.9% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 27.3% of school principals and 28.7% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 36.4% of principals and 23.5% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 16.8% of the teachers were rate disagree; whereas 3.0% of the principals and the 13.1% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies that, the majority of respondents indicate the factor is not favor to student's repetition.

Item.4-Inappropriate relationship of teacher with pupils, regarding this factor, 9.1% of the principals and 19% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 30.3% of school principals and 31.3% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 36.4% of principals and 18.7% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 9.1% of the principals and the 22.8% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 15.2% of the principals and the 8.2% of the teachers were

reply strongly disagree. So the result implies that, the majority of school principals respondents were reacting the issue is not favors to the students repetition, whereas the half of the teacher respondents were supporting as the factor was favoring to the students repetition.

Item.5-Poor usage of teaching aid materials, concerning to this factor 24.2% of the principals and 13.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 39.4% of school principals and 31.3% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 21.2% of principal's and 22.8% of teachers was not deciding their option. The 15.2% of the principals and the 17.9% of the teachers were rate disagreeing; where as 0% of the principals and the 11.9% of the teachers were replies strongly disagree. So the result implies that, the high number of school principals' respondents were reacting, the issue is favor to the students to redundant the same class, whereas high number of teachers were say not favor to students repetition.

Item.6-Poor usage of local specific example related to the portions, concerning to this issue, 15.2% of the principals and 13.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree. Whereas 45.5% of school principals and 29.9% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principals and 20.1% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 15.2% of the principals and the 26.0% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 9.3% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principal respondents were supporting, the factor is favor the students repetition, whereas high percent of teachers were reacting not favors to the problem.

Item.7-Poor continuous assessment practice of evaluation, concerning to this issue, 27.3% of the principals and 22.8% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 30.3% of school principals and 30.2% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 12.1% of principals and 16% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 23.5% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 6.1% of the principals and the 7.5% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were supporting, the factor is favor the student's repetition.

Item.8-Poor questioning skill of the teachers, concerning to this issue, 9.1% of the principals and 18.7% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 36.4% of school principal's and 26.9% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 27.3% of principals and 20.9% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 24.3% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 3.0% of the principals and the 9.3% of the teachers were reply

strongly disagree. So the result implies that more than half of the school principals and teachers respondents were indicating, the factor is not favor to the students repetition, whereas the rest says yes..

Item.9-Un suitable examination, concerning to this issue, 3% of the principal's and 14.2% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 54.5% of school principals and 35.8% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 18.2% of principal's and 13.4% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 24.2% of the principals and the 31.0% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 3.0% of the principals and the 13.1% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies more than half of the principals and teachers were supporting, the factor is favor to the student's repetition, whereas the less number says not.

Item.10-Teachers frequent absenteeism's, concerning to this issue, 15.2% of the principals and 12.3% teachers respondents were indicate strongly agree, whereas 33.3% of school principals and 31.0% of teachers were indicating agree. On the other hand 30.3% of principal's and 19% of teachers were not deciding their option. The 18.2% of the principals and the 27.8% of the teachers were rate disagree; where as 3.0% of the principals and the 10.4% of the teachers were reply strongly disagree. So the result implies almost half of the principals were supporting, the factor is favor the students repetition, on the contrary more than half of the teachers were reacting not the causes of the problem. Beside this 30% of school principals and 19% of teachers were not deciding .So this result implies that, the factor is influencing the instruction process.

This finding identified that, Poor classroom management of the teacher, Poor continuous assessment practice of evaluation and Unsuitable examinations, are the instructional process related factors causes to the students repetition, whereas, more of teacher centered teaching approach practice, in appropriate relationship of teachers with pupils, poor usage of teaching aid materials, poor usage of local specific example and teachers frequent absenteeism were indicated as most of the school principals are supporting the factors that causes students to redundant in the same grade, but teachers respondents reacting as not the factors favor to the students repetition.

These all on pinnacle of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to strongly agree, ranges of (8.6) to (25.1) and the percentage mean, (15.99) where as those responded agree, were ranges to (28) to (45.2) with the percentage mean of (35.5) respectively. The rated scale of undecided were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (13.3) to the highest percentage of (29.95) and with the total percentage mean of (20.53) respectively. The

scale rated disagrees were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (12.2) to maximum percentage (27.6) and the mean of (20.53) respectively. Those who were rated strongly disagree, was ranges, to minimum percentage of (5.05) to (11.7) highest percentage, and the mean of (7.29) respectively. Therefore, the 51.47 mean percentage of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the factors that favored to the students repetition in the same grade. Especially the highly stressed factors to the students repetition indicated by high percent of respondents were poor classroom managements of the teacher, poor continuous assessment practice and unsuitable examination. On the other hand (21.16) mean percentage of respondents were rated not decided to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas (27.82) of them were responded as disagree and strongly disagree respectively. These imply that, less number of respondents indicated, the factors raised are not favored to the students repetition.

Table 4.13 The school based factors to students' repetition respond by repeater students

No	Items	level	Respondents		No	Item	Level	Respondents		No	Items	level	Respondents	
			R.Students					R.Students					R.Students	
			N	%				N	%				N	%
1	High number of students learnt in a Section	VH	23	27	5	Difficulty of language of instructions	VH	21	24	9	Lack of experienced teachers	VH	23	27
		H	32	37			H	18	21			H	13	15
		Mo	9	11			Mo	15	17			Mo	19	22
		L	11	13			L	19	22			L	12	14
		VL	11	13			VL	13	15			VL	19	22
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100			Total	86	100
2	Poor infrastructure of the school	VH	23	27	6	Absence of instructional supervision.	VH	28	33	10	Content loaded curriculum	VH	20	23
		H	34	40			H	22	26			H	21	24
		Mo	5	6			Mo	20	12			Mo	20	23
		L	10	12			L	10	10			VH	10	12
		VL	14	16			VL	6	7			VL	15	17
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100			Total	86	100
3	Lack of text book	VH	19	22	7	Bad working environment due to poor management of the school	VH	22	26	11	Poor involvement of parents and community in mgt. of the school.	VH	23	27
		H	30	35			H	16	19			H	27	31
		Mo	3	4			Mo	17	20			Mo	9	11
		L	13	15			L	11	12			VH	8	9
		VL	21	24			VL	20	23			VL	19	22
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100			Total	86	100
4	Unattractiveness of the school environment.	VH	23	12.1	8	Lack of counseling service	VH	23	27	12	Poor management of school based academic support	VH	20	23.3
		H	17	20			H	22	26			H	25	29.1
		Mo	12	14			Mo	17	20			Mo	16	18.6
		L	16	19			L	12	14			VH	11	12.7
		VL	18	21			VL	12	14			VL	14	16.
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100			Total	86	100

VH=very high, H=high, Mo=moderate=low, VL=very low

According to the response given, by the students in the table, The school based factors such that, high number of students learnt in a section, poor infrastructure of the school, lack of text book, poor practice of instructional supervision, lack of counseling service, poor involvement of parents and community in mgt. of the schools and poor management of school based academic support are the school related factors causes to the students repetition. Whereas, poor attractiveness of the school environments, difficulty of language of instruction, bad working environment, lack of experienced teacher and content loaded curriculum, were indicated as the factors that influence students to redundant in the same grade,

These all on pinnacle of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to Very High, ranges of (12.1) to(27)and the percentage mean,(24.87) where as those responded High, were ranges to(15) to(40)with the percentage mean of(27.10)respectively. The rated scale of Moderate, were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (4) to the highest percentage of (23) and with the total percentage mean of (14.88) respectively. The scale rated Low, were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (9.0) to maximum percentage (22.0) and the mean of (13.73) respectively. Those who were rated Very Low, was ranges, to minimum percentage of (7.0) to (24.0) highest percentage, and the mean of (17.5) respectively. Therefore, the 51.97% of respondents were rated Very Highly and High to the factors that favored to the students repetition in the same grade. Specially the highly stressed factors to the students repetition indicated by high percent of respondents were high student section ratio, poor infrastructure of the school and poor implementation of instructional supervision, are the main. On the other hand (14.88%) of respondents were rated Moderate to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas,(31.23%)of them were responded as Low and Very Low respectively. These imply that, less number of respondents replied, the factors raised were not favored to the student's repetition.

Table 4.14 The instruction related factors to the student's repetition respond by repeater students

No	Items	level	Respondents		No	Item	Level	Respondents	
			R.Students					R.Students	
			N	%				N	%
1	Teachers frequent absenteeism	VH	27	31	6	Poor questioning skill of teachers	VH	32	37.2
		H	20	23			H	13	15.2
		Mo	15	17			Mo	19	22.1
		L	11	13			L	19	22.1
		VL	13	15			VL	3	3.4
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
2	Teachers use more time speaking in words to their lesson teaching	VH	32	37	7	Unsuitable examination	VH	32	37
		H	16	19			H	23	27
		Mo	13	15			Mo	9	11
		L	13	15			L	8	9
		VL	12	14			VL	14	16
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
3	Unhealthy relationship of teachers and pupils	VH	26	30	8	Poor teacher extra support to the students	VH	26	30
		H	9	11			H	34	40
		Mo	21	24			Mo	10	12
		L	20	23			L	13	15
		VL	10	12			VL	3	4
		Total	86	100			Total	86	28
4	Poor continuous assessment practice,	VH	22	26	9	Poor class room management of teachers	VH	16	19
		H	14	16			H	19	22
		Mo	24	28			Mo	14	16
		L	13	15			L	17	20
		VL	13	15			VH	20	23
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100
5	Poor usage of teaching aid materials	VH	30	35	10	Poor usage of simplify teaching method.	VH	26	30
		H	16	19			H	9	11
		Mo	24	28			Mo	21	24
		L	8	9			L	20	23
		VL	8	9			VH	10	12
		Total	86	100			Total	86	100

VH=very high, H=high, Mo=moderate,L=low,and VL=very low

As the students respond rated in the table -19-implies, the factors such as, teacher frequent absenteeism, teachers use more time speaking in words to their lesson teaching, poor usage of teaching aid materials, unsuitable examination and poor teacher extra support to the student are the instructional process related factors causes to the students repetition, whereas, Poor questioning skills of teachers,Un healthy teachers and students relationship, poor continuous

assessment practice, poor classroom management of teachers and poor usage of simplify teaching method, were the items which has impacts on the students to repeat grades. .

These all on pinnacle of pensioned factors were, condensed to the rated scale responded to Very High, ranges of (19.0) to(37.2)and the percentage mean,(31.22) where as those responded High, were ranges to(11) to(40)with the percentage mean of(20.32)respectively. The rated scale of Moderate, were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (11) to the highest percentage of (28) and with the total percentage mean of (19.71) respectively. The scale rated Low, were leveled ranges to the minimum percentage of (9.0) to maximum percentage (23.0) and the mean of (16.41) respectively. Those who were rated Very Low, was ranges, to minimum percentage of (3.4) to (23.0) highest percentage, and the mean of (12.34) respectively. Therefore, the 51.54% of respondents were rated Very High and High to the factors that favored to the students repetition in the same grade. Above all the vastly stressed factors to the students repetition indicated by high percent of respondents were poor teachers extra support to the students, unsuitable examination and teachers use more time speaking in words to their lesson teaching, are the main of the others. On the other hand (19.71%) of respondents were rated Moderate to the factors favored to the students dropouts, whereas (28.75%) of them were responded as Low and Very Low respectively. These imply that, less number of respondents was said, the factors raised were not favored to the student's repetition.

Table 4.15- School principal's belief towards the problems of dropout and repetition

No	Items	Level	Principals		No	Items	Level	Principals	
			N	%				N	%
1	I feel that high dropout in schools is high wastage in school	SA	8	24.2	7	I think school with high repetition rate is in efficient schools	SA	7	21.2
		Ag	11	33.3			Ag	18	54.5
		Und	5	15.2			Und	2	6.1
		DA	4	12.1			DA	5	15.2
		SDA	5	15.2			SDA	1	3.0
		Total	33	100			Total	33	100
2	I think schools with high dropout rate are inefficient school.	SA	7	21.2	8	I think school with high repetition rate is aschool that has quality school leadership	SA	3	9.1
		Ag	12	36.4			Ag	13	39.4
		Und	8	24.2			Und	7	21.2
		SDA	3	9.1			SDA	4	12.1
		Total	33	100			Total	33	100
3	I feel that improving dropout in schools is not the task of a teacher	SA	4	12.1	9	I think school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leadership.	SA	4	12.1
		Ag	8	24.2			Ag	11	33.3
		Und	7	21.2			Und	8	24.2
		DA	10	30.3			DA	9	27.3
		SDA	4	12.1			SDA	1	3.0
		Total	33	100			Total	33	100
4	I feel that improving dropout in schools is the task of a teacher.	SA	6	18.2	10	I believe that a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is in efficient teacher.	SA	1	3.0
		Ag	11	33.3			Ag	16	48.5
		Und	14	42.4			Und	7	21.2
		DA	1	3.0			DA	6	18.2
		SDA	1	3.0			SDA	3	9.1
		Total	33	100			Total	33	100
5	I feel that improving dropout in schools is the task of a school leader only.	SA	2	6.2	11	I believe aschool that allow high promotion rate is in efficient schools.	SA	3	9.1
		Ag	10	31.2			Ag	18	54.5
		Und	8	25.0			Und	6	18.2
		DA	8	25			DA	5	15.2
		SDA	4	12.5			SDA	1	3.0
		Total	32	100			Total	33	100
6	I believe making students to repeat grades improve the quality of the school.	SA	5	6.2					
		Ag	10	31.2					
		Und	6	18.3					
		DA	10	30.3					
		SDA	2	6.1					
		Total	33	100					

The perception of school principal respondents on different items related with dropout and repetition. On the table.20-.there was an item that asked to discover the views of the school principal's respondents respectively. Accordingly the questioner prepared for it occupies eleven items. Therefore the principal participants were, given their response as follows. According to the response in the table the perception of the school principals identified show that on 1st item, (45.5%) of principals were said, making students to repeat grades improve the quality of the school, whereas (54.6%) of the school principals replied, making students to repeat grade were not improve the quality of the school. On 2nd item, the (75%) of principals were indicated, the school with high repetition rate is inefficient schools, whereas the others said, it is efficient schools. On 3rd item, the (57.5%) of the school principals were indicated, high drop out in schools is high wastage of school, the others (42.5%) were indicated, high drop out in schools is not high wastage of the school. On the 4th item the (57.6%) of principals were voiced; the school with high dropout rate is inefficient school, whereas (42.4%) principals said that, the school with high dropout is efficient school. On 5th item the (51.5%) of the principals indicated; a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is inefficient teacher, while (48.5%) principals were rated, as a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is efficient teacher. On 6th item the (45.4%) of the principals said, the school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leadership, while (54.6%) of the principals were indicated, the school with high repetition rate is not a school that has poor school leadership. On the 7th item the (36.3%) of principals were indicated, improving dropout in schools is not the task of a teacher, whereas (63.6%) of the same respondents were shown as the task of a teacher. 8th item the (63.6%) of principals respondents, indicated, the school that allow high promotion rate is inefficient schools, whereas the remained (36.4%) of the respondent were indicated, it is efficient school.

On 9th item the (51.5%) of principals were rated improving dropout in schools is the task of a teacher, while (48.5%) respondents were rated, not a task of a teacher .The 10th item (.48.5%) of principals indicated, the school with high repetition rate is a school that has quality school leadership, whereas, the others said, has not quality school leadership. 11th item the (37.4%) of principals were indicated improving dropout in schools is the task of a school principals only, while (62.6%) principals were rated not the task of the principals only.

Table 4.16 Teacher's belief towards the problems of dropout and repetition in the school

No	Items	Level	Teachers		No	Items	Level	Teachers	
			N	%				N	%
1	I feel that high dropout in schools shows high wastage in school.	SA	47	17.5	7	I think school with high repetition rate is inefficient schools.	SA	45	16.8
		Ag	101	37.7			Ag	92	34.3
		Und	51	19.0			Und	43	16
		DA	48	17.9			DA	58	21.6
		SDA	21	7.8			SDA	30	11.2
		Total	268	100			Total	268	100
2	I think schools with high dropout rate are inefficient school.	SA	42	15.7	8	I think school with high repetition rate is school that has quality school leadership.	SA	49	18.3
		Ag	95	35.4			Ag	79	29.5
		Und	48	17.9			Und	50	18.7
		DA	63	23.5			DA	61	22.8
		SDA	20	7.5			SDA	29	10.8
		Total	268	100			Total	268	100
3	I feel that improving dropout in schools is not the task of a teacher.	SA	45	16.8	9	I think school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leadership.	SA	37	13.8
		Ag	73	27.2			Ag	90	33.6
		Und	57	21.3			Und	53	19.8
		DA	64	23.9			DA	59	22.0
		SDA	29	10.8			SDA	29	10.8
		Total	268	100			Total	268	100
4	I feel that improving dropout in schools is the task of a teacher.	SA	45	16.8	10	I believe that a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is inefficient teacher.	SA	40	14.9
		Ag	84	31.3			Ag	79	29.5
		Und	57	21.3			Und	49	18.3
		DA	55	20.5			DA	77	28.7
		SDA	27	10.1			SDA	23	8.6
		Total	268	100			Total	268	100
5	I feel that improving dropout in schools is the task of a school leader only.	SA	45	16.9	11	I believe a school that allow high promotion rate is inefficient schools.	SA	45	16.9
		Ag	72	27.0			Ag	72	27
		Und	69	25.8			Und	69	25.8
		DA	53	19.9			DA	53	19.9
		SDA	28	10.5			SDA	28	10.5
		Total	267	100			Total	268	100
6	I believe making students to repeat grades improve the quality of the school.	SA	54	20.1					
		Ag	95	35.4					
		Und	37	13.8					
		DA	65	24.3					
		SDA	17	6.3					
		Total	268	100					

According to the data indicated in the table 21- there was an item that asked to discover the views of the respondent teachers respectively. According to the questioner prepared it occupies eleven items. Therefore the teacher participants were, given their response as follows. The perception of teaches on the 1st item, showing that, (55.6%) of teachers were, making students to repeat grades

improve the quality of the school, whereas (44.4%) teachers replied, making students to repeat grade were not improve the quality of the school. The 2nd item (51.1%) of teachers were indicated, the school with high repetition rate is inefficient schools, whereas (48.9%) of teachers said efficient schools. On the 3rd item (55.2%) of teachers were indicated, high drop out in schools is high wastage of school, whereas, the (44.8%) of teachers were indicated, high drop out in schools is not high wastage of the school. The 4th item (51.1%) of teachers were voiced; the school with high dropout rate is inefficient school, whereas (48.9%) of teachers said that, the school with high dropout is efficient school. The 5th item (44.4%) of teachers indicated, teacher that makes students to repeat grades is inefficient teacher, while (55.6%) teachers were rated, as a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is efficient teacher. On the 6th item (47.4%) of the teachers said, the school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leadership, while the (52.6%) of teachers were indicated, the school with high repetition rate is not a school that has poor school leadership. The 7th item indicate that, (44.04%) of teachers were said, improving dropout in schools is not the task of a teacher. whereas (56.0%) of the same respondents were shown as the task of a teacher. The 8th item pointed that, (48.5%) of teachers respondents, indicated, the school that allow high promotion rate is inefficient schools, whereas the remained (53.3%) of the respondents were indicated, it is efficient school. The 9th item indicated that (48.1%) of teachers were rated improving dropout in schools is the task of a teacher, while (51.9%) of teachers respondents were rated, improving dropout is not a task of a teacher. The 10th item (47.8%) of teachers indicated, the schools with high repetition rate is a school that has quality school leadership, whereas the (52.3%) of the teacher respondents said, school with high repetition rate is a school that has not quality school leadership. The 11th item (43.9%) of teachers was indicated improving dropout in schools is the task of school directors only, while (56.1%) of teachers were said not the task of the principals only.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary, conclusion and recommendations. In this part first, summary of the study and the major findings were done. Then conclusions of the fundamental finding were drawn. Lastly some possible recommendations were forwarded on the basis of the findings of the study.

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study is to determine the factor that influences the primary education, and identifies the major causes of the problems and find out effective solution and to give scientific judgment for the difficulty of education wastage through dropout and repetition. In order to achieve this purpose, the following specific questions were raised in the study.

1. What is the major cause of students' drop-out in 2nd level (5-8) primary schools of west Hararghe zone?
2. What is the major cause of students' grades repetition in 2nd level primary schools of west Hararghe zone?
3. What extent and its influence of education wastage in 2nd level (5-8) primary schools of west Hararghe zone?

The gathered data mainly through questionnaire, interview and document analysis were also employed. The data sources were education office, head teachers, teachers', students and parents. The data obtained were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean scores and t-test. Based on the analysis of the data, the following findings were obtained from the study.

5.1.1 Major Finding

5.1.1.1 Concerning the characteristics of the respondents

The main purpose of the research was to investigate the cause of educational wastage in the case of west Hararghe zone. The finding of the study and its interpretation was through analysis of data gathered in the form of questionnaire, interview and related documents.

Of the total distributed questionnaires 99.6% were completed and returned to the researcher and Parents were participating on interview.

As the organized data concerning the characteristics of the respondents indicate that, sex distribution of the total 532 participants the majority of them were male, so this implies that the participation of women to the school principals and teachers were not equivalent to the male.

In terms of age distribution most of the principals and the teachers were in the age level of 31 to 60. So this evidence shows that, most of the school leaders are not represented from the young age.

Concerning educational qualifications, the majority of the school principals and the lesser of teachers respondents were degree holders, whereas the less number of principals and most of teachers were diploma holders. So it implies that, the education given for this level is not fulfilled with the essential qualified man power as the setting standards for the level.

The human resource recruitment and development guideline of (MoE, 2002) indicates that the minimum educational requirement for primary 2nd level teachers is degree of education while primary school principals need to have at least a first degree in any fields of study.

Regarding the working service, most of the school principals and teachers respondents have high service years. This implies that, the schools has, an opportunity to practice exposure exchanges and it creates an access for mentis teacher to have mentors closely.

Respondents' service in current schools, the majority of them has few service years in the current schools. Therefore this implies that, there were high teachers and directors turn over in the sector or to the other sectors.

Regarding area of specialization of the school principals respondents, most of them were taken indirect course only. The result implies that the majority of the school principals were not trained school leadership. Therefore most of the sample schools have directed by those directors who were not have the course. So, this leads to education quality problems.

In terms of age distribution, most of Student respondents were in the age group of 11to15years.The rest was between16to20years respectively. Therefore, the events indicate that, the majority of the dropout and the repeater participants were at the school age level. The rest were beyond the school age. Therefore this implies that, many stray students were enrolling in the elementary education.

Concerning students respondent grade level, the majority of the participants were from seventh grade and eight grade students. These events indicate that, most of the students respondents were matured enough and could express themselves properly.

In terms of parents respondents the majority of parents' participants were adults. The position they had in their family were fathers, So this implies that, most of the time fathers were the head of their family. The majority of parent respondents have the maximum of five children. It gives clue that the rulers' were starting to practice living in planning.

5.1.1.2 Zonal education Second cycle primary school dropout and repetition

According to the data indicated in the table 4.4- the dropout rate for second cycle primary school (5-8) show that no fluctuate from year to year in the last two consecutive years (2009-2010). It was almost nearest to the same outcome. As a result the rates analyzed in the year 2009 was the total percentage of (15.3) male (22.3) female and Total of(19.3)dropout respectively, whereas by 2010the dropout rate was resulted (14.8) male, (21.0) female and total of (17.9) respectively. On the other hand, (7.8)male, (9.1) female and total of (8.4) repetition were rated in the year 2009 respectively. On the next 2010 academic year (6.8) male,(8.3) female and (7.5)the total mean parentage of repetition were rated respectively. Of the two continuative years dropout rate, there was a slightly difference in the year 2010 than 2009academic year. But in both years the analyzed data showed that, there was high dropout of learners in the second cycle primary schools in the zone. In the case of repetition, in the year 2010, there was better handling the case than the repetition rate in 2009 academic year. However, in both years, the data processed about the issue was shown; many students were repeated in grades.

Relating to gender, the table indicated that there were high dropout rates of girls than boy in both years respectively. In the same case, there were high repetition rate of girls than boys in all exemplar time. Related to the grade level, there was high dropout rate in 5th, 6th and7th grade

persistently, where as in grade- 8 there was moderate dropped out rate but not undermine number of dropped learners were out of the system.

The condensed dropout and repetition rate through the year of 2009 was, 27.7percent, where as in the next years 2010, the dropout and repetition rate were 25.4 percent respectively. This event implies that, the internal efficiency of the education was extremely lesser through these problems continuously. So it needs to find solution to eradicate or to minimize it.

5.1.1.3-School based factors favor to learners dropout respond by principals and teachers

The evidence rated on the items (1-6) in table 4.5- indicate that, each of the school related factors which are causes to the students' dropout were identified through the vote given from each of the respondents according to the scale provided on the survey. So, concerning to this research, the rank of the items has given by identifying the frequency, range, percentage and the mean of each result to the ranking scales. Through the direction set the item which has got, high rank respond on the levels of strongly agree and agree to the point were taken as the factors which is the causes of the problems that the research is targeting on. On the other hand the factors which have got less rank to the respond vote were taken as the factors that have influence on the student's dropout.

So that based on this implication the factors, long distance from home to school, lack of educational materials, influence of peer groups and cultural impacts were identified as the factors that causes to the students dropouts, whereas the factors such as lack of the school facilities and corporal punishment are the school related factors that can influence the students to dropout from the schools.

Parent interviewees replied that the major reason was related to parents' economic problem, students' needs to trade chat and lack of school facilities, especially shortage of water at the drought season. The remaining other interviewees were also replied that children dropout from school is due to parents need for children labor to participate in their families work and cultural impact were the main problems for students dropout

5.1.1.4 Learners related factors to students dropout respond by principals and teachers

The evidence rated of the items(1-6) in table4.6- indicate that, each of the learners related factors causes to the students' dropout were identified through the vote given from each of the respondents according to the scale provided on the survey. So, concerning to this research, the

rank of the items has given by identifying the frequency, range, percentage and the mean of each result to the ranking scales. Through the direction set, the item which has got high rank respond on the levels of strongly agree and agree to the point were taken as the factors which is the causes of the problems that the research is targeting on. On the other hand the factors which have got less rank to the respond vote were taken as the factors that have influence on the student's dropout.

So that, these findings pointed that, students lack of interest in their learning, Students poor academic performance, Students frequent absenteeism and Students needs to trade chat were learners based causes of students drop out of the target researched area. .particularly the extremely stressed factors to the students drop out by almost all respondents were “the students need to trade chat can be taken as example, whereas students frequent repetition and frustration during examination are indicated as pupils based factors that influence students to dropout from the school.

5.1.1.5 Parent related factors to the learners' dropout respond by principals and teachers,

Based on the evidence rated the items in table4.7- regarding the parent related factor by the principals' and teachers respond, the 55.3%of them were indicted highly agree and agree to the item raised to vote and 21.66% of them were rated not decided to the factor favor for the students' dropout, whereas the rest23.33% of them was responds as disagree and strongly disagree to the item expose to them.

So that, the result implies that, the factors such as, lack of parental encouragements of the students, families lower standards of living, students' involvement in the families work and parental illness or death are parent or home based factors causes to dropout, whereas families stop working, and unsafe road condition from home to school were voted the factors that can be influence learners to dropouts.

5.1.1.6 The school, learner and parental related factors to dropout respond by students

The dropout students respond on, and identified the items given in table (4.8, 4.9, and4.10) as the school based, learners, and parent related factors to the students dropout. Then these finding were condensed and presented as:

Long distance from home to school, lack of educational materials, and shortage of school facilities and influence of peer groups were the school based factors causes students dropouts, whereas use of corporal punishment, and cultural impacts were the factors that has influence to the students to dropout from the school.

The student's frequent absenteeism from the school, students gave lesser attention to their learning and students need to trade chat, were learner related factors that causes to the students dropout, whereas poor academic performance, frustration during examination, and frequent repetition were the factors that influence students to dropout.

The parent related factor like, lack of parental encouragement, families lower standards of living and involvement of the students in the family work, were the parent related factors that causes to the students dropout, whereas, parents stop working, parental illness or death, and unsafe road condition to the school were factors that influence the students to dropout from the school

5.1.1.7 School based factors to the student's repetition respond by principals and teachers

The evidence rated on the items(1-12) in table 4.11- indicate that, each of the school based factors cause to the students repetition, were identified through the vote given from each of the respondents according to the scale provided on the survey. So, concerning to this research, the rank of the items has given by identifying the frequency, range, percentage and the mean of each result to the ranking scales. Through the direction set the item which has got, high rank respond on the levels of strongly agree and agree to the point were taken as the factors which is the causes of the problems that the research is targeting on. On the other hand the factors which have got less rank to the respond vote were taken as the factors that have influence on the students to repetition in grades. So that, the 56.85% of respondents were rated highly agree and agree to the factors that favored to the students repetition. On the other said (16.85%) of respondents were undecided to the factors favored to the students repetition, whereas (26.75%) of them were responded as disagree and strongly disagree respectively. So that, the less number of respondents were said the factors raised has not favored to the students repeat in grades.

So, these findings pointed that, high students section ratio, poor infrastructure of the schools, lack of textbook, poor involvement of parents and community in the school, lack of experienced teachers, poor practice of instructional supervision support program, were school based causes of students repetition of the target researched area. Mainly the highly stressed factors to the students repetition by almost all respondents were "high students section ratio, lack of text books, and

poor practice of instructional supervision supports, whereas difficulty of language of instruction, inappropriateness of school environment for instructional program, lack of counseling service and bad working environment due to poor conflict management of the school were indicated as factors that influence learners to redundant in grades.

5.1.1.8 Instruction related factors to student repetition respond by principals and teachers

The evidence condensed to the items(1-10) in table-12 indicate that, each of the school based factors causes to the students repetition, were identified through the vote given from each of the respondents according to the scale provided on the survey.

This finding identified that, Poor classroom management of the teacher, Poor continuous assessment practice of evaluation and Unsuitable examinations, were the instruction related factors causes to the students repetition, whereas, more of teacher centered teaching approach practice, in appropriate relationship of teachers with pupils, poor usage of teaching aid materials, poor usage of local specific example and teachers frequent absenteeism were indicated as most of the school principals were supporting the factors that causes students to repeated in grades, but teachers respondents reacting as not the factors favor to the students repetitions. More over these, the factors, such as poor classroom management of the teachers, poor continuous assessment practice and unsuitable examinations were indicated as the factors which had influence to the students repetition.

5.1.1.9 School based factors to the learners repetition respond by the repeater students

According to the response given, by the repeater students in the table 4.13- on the items (1-12), the school based factors such that, high number of students learnt in a section, poor infrastructure of the school, lack of text book, poor practice of instructional supervision, lack of counseling service, poor involvement of parents and community in mgt. of the schools and poor management of school based academic support are the school related factors causes to the students repetition, whereas, un attractiveness of in the school environments, difficulty of language of instruction, bad working environment, lack of experienced teacher and content loaded curriculum, were indicated as the factors that influence students to redundant in the same grade,

5.1.1.10 Instruction related factors to learner repetition respond by the repeater students

As the students respond rated in the table-14 implies, the factors such as, teacher frequent absenteeism, teacher use more time speaking in words to their lesson teaching, poor usage of teaching aid materials, unsuitable examination and poor teacher extra support to the student, were the instructional process related factors causes to the students repetition, whereas, Poor questioning skills of teachers, inappropriate relation of teachers and students relationship, poor continuous assessment practice, poor classroom management of teachers and poor usage of simplify teaching method, were the items which has impacts on the students to repeat grades. .

5.1.1.11 Teachers' and Principals Perception towards Internal Efficiency

According to the response given by the majority of school principals and teachers, the items positively perceive towards to the students drop out and repetition were, the school with high repetition rate is inefficient school, high dropout in schools is high wastage of the school, the school with high dropout rate is inefficient schools. Their perception implies that, both the school principals and teachers respondents had the same accepting of the issue.

The items negatively perceive by the majority of schools principals and teachers respondents were, the school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leadership, improving dropout in school is not the task of a teacher, the school with high repetition rate is a school that has quality school leadership, and improving dropout in school is the task of a school director only. Their perception implies that, they were not agreeing to this issue.

Repeating grades improve school quality, teacher that makes students to repeat grade is inefficient teacher and the school that allow high promotion rate is efficient school were the items that indicated perception difference shown by the majority of director and teacher respondents

5.2. Conclusions

In order to implement various programs in Ethiopia to work towards the achievements of the GTP (Growth and Transformation Program) in education sector, several activities were made within all over the country. Despite the achievement this paper tried to assess the current trends in internal efficiency in second cycle primary education of west Hararghe zone. Based on the finding of this research the major factors that causes students drop out of the school and class repetition which leads to educational wastage in 2nd cycle primary schools of west Hararghe zone were concluded as follows.

In most woredas of West Hararghe zone primary schools walk along distance from home to get primary school education. This far distance walk to school is causes to students loose giving attention to their learning, and leads to score poor academic performance. These make them frequently absent from the school and eventually drop out of the school.

Cultural impacts like parents needs the children to involve in their labor work, parents permits early mirages and parent not encourage their children to their learning, for the reason of situational problems were the causes for students to dropout from the schools.

The economic issues of learners parent is the other factors favors to the students drop out of the school. The majority of the students come to school from the families of farming background with lower living standards and others little income earning faction of society. So that students are forced to or willingly involve in different activities, such as chat trading or join in their families line of work like, farming to overcome the economic challenges .So these results the students drop out of school.

School and instruction based factors also hold high percentage in causing students dropout and repetition in the schools. These factors such that Lack of school facilities: toilets, potable water, sport filed and recreation areas and shortage of teaching class room causes high students section ratio were the school based factors causes to students dropout.

Lack of teaching materials, text books, lack of students counseling service and school based academic supports, poor practice of instructional supervision support, poor continuous assessment and unsuitable evaluation practice, poor classroom management system of teachers and wastage of period allotted to the specific subjects were the major school and teaching based factors causes to students repetition needs to follow up and solution

According to the zonal education annual statistical abstract (2009-2010) the dropout and repetition rate in each school years were 27.7, and 25.4 respectively while, the drop-out and repetition rate in the sample schools were 10.4, 10.09, 16.28, 12.9 and 10.5 in each school years (2006-2010) respectively. These data implies that there were high dropout and repetition problem in the primary schools of the zone. So that, this shows there were education wastage problems. There were also high percentage i.e., 31.4 and 29.3 female learners dropout and repetition in each school years (2009-2010) respectively. This indicates female students repeat grades and dropout of the school than male students.

The finding also implies that there was high principals and teachers turn over indicated in their current school service years, this by itself has a significant contribution to the education wastage. so, it needs attention.

There were also perception difference and conviction between the majority of school principals and teachers respondents on the issue of improving education wastage through dropout and repetition.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the major findings the following recommendations are suggested

The study indicate that, the major school based factors such as long distance from home to school, Lack of educational materials, influence of age group, cultural impacts, and lack of school facilities were found to be the main causes of the students dropout. Economic problems, parents need the children labors for their work and lack of school facilities especially shortage of water at the drought season were the main problem focusing by the interview of the parent. So it wants special attention to eradicate or minimize the problem from educational leaders, governmental and none governmental bodies.

Students need to trade chat, students frequent absenteeism, Students give less attention for their learning and poor academic performance of them were the main learners related factors causes to dropouts. So that, it needs attention from government, the community and parents to minimize or to handle it.

It is known that the chat has economic ground for the peoples of Hararghe, even though it has benefit, the main causes of the students dropout were the learners paying attention to trade chat for the reason of their economic problems. This problem is vast and most of the respondents

were justified its negative impact. So it needs special attention from every corner of responsible bodies and education structure to stop the need of improper usage of children labor and mobilizing them to dropout and follow the merchants of the chat rather than attaining their learning.

Lack of parental encouragements of the students, Families lower standards of living, Students involvement in the families work, Parental illness or death, were the major parents related factors causes to students dropout identified by all respondent. So, it recommended that, it had better if governmental and none governmental bodies and every education stockholders will take the problems in to consideration and make it plan and do in order to minimize and handling the problems.

High students section ratio, poor infrastructure of the schools, Lack of text books, poor involvements of parents and community in the school, and poor practice of instructional supervision support programs were the main school based factors that causes of students repetition identified by all respondents. Lack of counseling service and poor mgt. of school based academic supports were also the school based factors stressed by high vote of repeater students respondents. It recommends that the problems needs attention from regional, zonal and woreda education offices and other responsible bodies should find solution in order to handling the problems.

Poor classroom management of teachers, poor continuous assessment practice and unsuitable examination, were the instruction related factors that causes of students class repetition. But Teachers frequent absenteeism, poor usage of teaching aids materials and lack of teachers extra support to the students were the factors focused on by the students respondents. Therefore it needs attention from the schools and instruction leadership bodies and teachers as whole.

There was high number of indirect course holder of school leaders indicated in the finding.so it needs attention from the responsible bodies, especially zonal and woreda education office, the schools should have to govern if with well trained school leaders.

There was less internal efficiency of education observed through dropout and repetition problems in the zone and the female learners dropout and repetition rate were higher. So it needs especial attention from every corner of responsible bodies' i.e. the region, zone and woreda education offices and school level educational leaders, teachers and other stockholders of education.

As it was indicated on the findings there was belief individual difference towards the problem of internal efficiency between principals and teachers respondents, as regards minimizing dropouts and improving reiteration of students in their school. So that, in order to break the problem of miss understanding about less result of internal efficiency were to leads educational wastage then affects, the coming generation enrollment and the intake capacity of the school. So I recommend that the difference seen in the school has to be negotiating through training and discussion.

(Halper,1986:193), The existence of wastage in one of its forms, if a timely measure is not taken to reduce it, will ultimately allow a room for another form of wastage that may ultimately lead the entire educational system to crisis. Inefficiency in the achievement of educational objectives that may be caused by various factors including the incidents of repetition and dropping-out or their combined effect, that has been hampered by an increasing drop-out and repetition rates or low performance level.

Finally it recommends that,properly implement duties and responsibilities, respect rule and regulation, strengthening discipline, managing school facilities, equipment and textbooks, conducting co-curricular activities and properly structuring internal supervision and restructuring external supervision support programs in the education system would help to partly overcome education wastage problems in the schools.

REFERENCE

- Abagi,O.&Odipo, G (1997).Efficiency of primary education. Substantial analysis and Implication for education reform.Nairobi.IPAR.
- Adamu,B (2000).Financial implication of educational wastage in secondary schools in Ondosate Journal of professional educators 1(1a), 9-15
- Audrey,s.(2009),The consequence of dropping out of High school: Joblessness and Jailing for High school Dropouts and the High cost for Taxpayers,centre for labour market studies:North-eastern university.
- Akindele, J. B. (2015), Wastage factor in universal basic education program
- Ayaji, I. A. &Mbah, G. U. (2008), Trend of educational wastage rate in Ekiti state public Primary schools.
- Charles,G(2013),The effects of Teenage pregnancy on the educational Attainment of Girls at chvrkor,a suburb of Accra Journal of Educational and Social Research.
- Clive,B.&Levin,M(2007).The price we pay: Economic and social consequences of Inadequate Education,Washington,DC:Brookings institution press.
- Clive,R.B.(2008).The Economic Consequences of inadequate Education for the puer to Rican population in the united states:Centro de Estudios puertorriquenos:Hunter College Queens college CUNY.
- David, S. & Jeffrey, S. (2010). *California high school dropouts: examining the fiscal Consequences*. Retrieved from <https://www.edchoices.org>.
- Deribe D. K, Endale B. D &Ashebir B. E (2015). Factors contributing to educational Wastage in primary level: the case of Lanfuro Woreda, Southern Ethiopia. *Global Journal of human-social science: linguistics and Education*. 15(1)9-20

- Desarrollo, I. (2007). *The quality of education in Latin America and Caribbean Latin America*. Paraguay, research work institute Desarrollo.
- Eisenman, T. (1997). *Reducing Repetition: Issues and strategies*. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO FAWE, (1997). *A Report of second Ministerial consultation 13-14 October 1997*: Dakar, Senegal.
- Freudenberg, N & Ruglis, J. (2007). Reframing school dropout as a public health issue, public health research practice and policy.
- Finn, J., & Voekl, K. (1993). School Characteristics Related to Student Engagement. *Journal of Negro Education*, 62(3), 249-268.
- Gatawa, B. S. M. (1998). *Quality- Quantity Dilemma in Education: The Zimbabwe Experience*. Harare: College Press.
- Freudenberg, N & Ruglis, J. (2007). Reframing school dropout as a public health issue, public health research practice and policy.
- Hint, F. (2007), schooling citizens: A study of policy in practice in south Africa unpublished D.phil Thesis, Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Karimganj, Assam, Wastage and Stagnation in Primary schools Jayeeta Bhatta charjee Faculty, Vivekananda college of Education, India
- King, E. & Hill, W. (Ed) (1993). *Women Education in developing countries, Barriers, Benefits and Policies*. Washington D.C: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Kiumi J.K & chiuri L.W (2005), *Planning and Economic of Education* Nairobi: Pongolin pub Limited.
- Lawrence, M. (1995). Secondary School Wastage, Continuing Education and Youth 'Unemployment in Zambia. *Journal of educational studies* 17(2), 30-36.

- Matage j. M, Kyalo B. W &Dr.Shadrack S. (2014). Factors influencing educational Wastage among girls in secondary schools in Kenya.A case of Kisiicentral district. *European scientific journal*11 (16)398-412.
- Mugenda, O. M. &Mugenda, A. G. (2003).*Research methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Muhammad, F.J & Muhammad, A.K (2011).*Determining the factors influencing the drop Out in Government primary schools of Karachi, Pakistan*: Federal Urdu University.
- Muriithi, J. (2011). *Factors contributing to educational wastage in public and private Secondary schools in Municipality Division, Nyeri District, Central Province*. Nairobi: M.ED Thesis, UON.
- Mutinda, A. K. (2013). *Institutional and home based factors influencing student drop out in day secondary schools in kathiani district, Machakos*. Nairobi. University of Nairobi.
- Mutwota, H. (2013). *Socio-economic factors influencing wastage of pupils in public Primary schools in Igembe south district*.Nairobi. University of Nairobi.
- Neto,G&Honushek,E.A(1994).causes and consequences of Grade Repetition: Evidence from Brazil,Chicago,University of Chicago press.
- Ncube, N.J (2004).Managing the quality of Education in Zimbabwe: The internal Efficiency of Rural Day schools, Unpublished PhD. Thesis,Harare:University of Zimbabwe.
- Ngau.M(1991)Grade repetition and school dropout in Kenya primary schools,Acritical Analysis of access and Equity Issues in Education PhD Dissertation.
- Odango,A&Heneveld,W.(1995),Girls andSchooling in sub Saharan African,from Analysis to action Washington dc:the World Bank.
- Orwasa, K.B (2014).An assessment of factors contributing to educational wastage in secondary schools in Kericho country, M.Ed.project: Kenyatta university.

- Orwasa, K.B. (2014). *An assessment of factors contributing to educational wastage in Secondary schools in Kericho County*, M.Ed. project: Kenyatta University.
- Psacharopolous,G.&Woodhall,M,(1985)*Education for development on analysis of investment choices*, Washington D.C:Oxford University press.
- Rajesh, E. & Dr.Prohlad,R.(2014). Education wastage: a problem of primary education.*American international journal of research in humanities, arts and social sciences*5(1), 31-34
- Rumberger, R. W. (2008). *Why students drop out of school: a review of 25 years of Research*. Retrieved from http://cdrp.ucsb/dropouts/pubs_report.htm,google scholar.
- ShibaPrasalRijal, (PHD) *Wastage in Primary Education: Dropout and repetition at primary schools in palpaDistrict*,
- UNESCO (1970).*Educational trends; an international survey*. Paris.
- UNESCO (1971).*Wastage in education, a world problem*. Paris.
- Yusuf M. A (2014) *Wastage of secondary education in Ekiti South senatorial District of ekitistate*. *International journal of Asian social science*. 4(12), 1155-1

Appendix

1-Questionnaire to be filled by school principals

Dear- Directors and Teachers

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information that will help investigating factor related to drop out and repetition of students in selected 2nd cycle primary schools of west Harerghe zone. It is purely academic study and in no way affects you personally or organizationally because information supplied through this questionnaire will be treated in strict confidence and personal details will be kept indefinite.

As the result and success of the study will depend on the quality of your response, please give honest responses to the items presented. There is no right or wrong answer and what is required is to indicate your level of personal opinion to each item your responses will be classified and used only for academic purpose and you do not need to write your name. Thank you in advance for your time and sincere cooperation.

Direction: The following statements are about your personal information please write the necessary information on the blank spaces provided and in the optional items, indicate your answer by putting 'X' Mark in the box.

Part- I- Background Information

1-Name of the school _____ 2- Level of the school _____

3-Region _____ 4-Zone _____ 5-woreda _____

6- Sex Male Female

7-Age, 20-30 31-40 41-50 51-60

8- Indicate your principal's educational field of study

PGPSL EDPM I, haven't taken a directors course

9-Your Current Highest Educational level

Diploma Degree MA M Other if any

10 -For how long have you been in teaching?

Below one year

1-5

6-10

11-15

Over20years

11-Please indicate how long you have lead in your current school,

Less than a year

1-5

6-10

11-15

16-20

Over20 years

12-please indicate, if you do have any other field of work experience_____

13-Your net total work experience_____

14-9-Please indicate your teaching profession educational field of study or subject _____

15-Dear teacher, please indicate your current position in the school beside the teaching work,

H/R/teacher Dep /Head Mentor Pedagogical center

Indicate, if any other_____

Section-A: Rate the following factors that favor students to drop out in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting on 'X' mark in a column you select. The choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Key: A=Strongly Agree B=Agree
 C=Undecided D=Disagree E=strongly disagree

No	Item	AG	A	Und	DA	SDA
2.1	Long distance from home to school					
2.2	Students' lack of interest in learning					
2.3	Poor academic performance (fear of failure)					
2.4	Frequent repetition					
2.5	Lack of counseling service when facing a problem (at school level)					
2.6	Frequent absenteeism					
2.7	Un safe road condition from home to school					
2.8	Shortage of school facilities					
2.9	Use of corporal punishment by school					
2.10	Lack of parental encouragement					
2.11	Healthy problem/Sickness					
2.12	Family disunity/family stop working					
2.13	Parental illness or death(family problem)					
2.14	Frustration during examination					
2.15	Involvement in family work					
2.16	Influence of peer group					
2.17	Lack of educational materials					
2.18	Cultural impact/irritation					
2.19	Families low standard of living					
2.20	Students need to trade chat.					

Section-B: Rate the following school based factors that favor students to repeat grade in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting 'X' mark in a column you select. The choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Key= A=strongly Agree B=Agree C=Undecided D=Disagree E=strongly disagree

No	Item	SA	Ag	und	DA	SDA
3.1	High student section ratio					
3.2	Poor infrastructure of the school					
3.3	Lack of text books					
3.4	Appropriateness of school environment for instructional programs					

3.5	Lack of experienced teachers					
3.6	Content loaded curriculum/ heavy curriculum					
3.7	Difficulty of language of instruction					
3.8	Teachers frequent absenteeism in classroom instruction					
3.9	Teaching approaches of teachers is dominantly teacher centered					
3.10	Teachers do not use teaching aid materials ,to make students understand their lesson					
3.11	Teachers do not use local specific example to make students understand their lesson					
3.12	Poor continuous assessment practice by giving class work, home work, test and project work					
3.13	Poor questioning skill of teachers or unsuitable examination					
3.14	Poor teacher extra support to the student who are in need of it					
3.15	Poor class room management of teachers.					
3.16	Inappropriate relationship of teachers with their pupils					
3.17	Involvement of parents and community in management of the school					
3.18	Absence of instructional supervision support for class room instruction by principals of the school					
3.19	Poor management of school based students academic support programs such as tutorial and girls special support					
3.20	Bad working environment due to Poor conflict management of the school					

Section-C: The following items are meant to address issues related to your belief towards the problem of internal efficiency in your school. Based on our opinion put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting an ‘X’mark in a column you select. The choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Key- A=strongly Agree B=Agree C=Undecided D=Disagree E=strongly- disagree

No	Item	SA	Ag	Und	DA	SDA
4.1	I believe that making students to repeat grades improve the quality of the school.					
4.2	I think school with high repetition rate is inefficient schools.					
4.3	I feel that high dropout in schools is high wastage of school.					
4.4	I think schools with high dropout rate are in efficient schools.					
4.5	I believe that a teacher that makes students to repeat grades is in efficient					

	teacher.					
4.6	I think school with high repetition rate is a school that has poor school leader ship.					
4.7	I feel that improving drop out in Schools is not the task of a teacher					
4.8	I believe a school that allow high promotion rate is inefficient schools					
4.9	I feel that improving dropout in schools is the task of a teacher.					
4.10	I think a school with high repetition rate is a school that has quality school leader ship.					
4.11	I feel that improving drop out in schools is the task of a school leader/Director only.					

2-Questionnaire to Be Filled by Students

Dear Student!

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information that will help investigating factors related to drop out and repetition of students in selected 2nd level primary schools of West Hararghe zone. It is purely academic study and in no way affects you personally or organizationally because information supplied through this feedback form will be treated in strict confidentiality and personal details will be kept unspecified. For the success of this study your genuine, frank and timely responses are very crucial. Therefore, kindly request your honest cooperation to fill this questionnaire. Be grateful in advance for your cooperation!

General Direction!

- A) You need not write your name on the paper.
- B) Put a tick “X” mark on the space provided.
- C) Write additional options if any, on the space provided.
- D) Please follow instructions provided for each part.

Part- I Background Information

1.1-Name of the school_____

1.2-Region_____

1.3-Zone_____

1.4-Woreda_____

1.5-Sex male Female

1.6-Age, <11 11 12 13 14 >14

1.7-Grade level, grade- 5 ___grade-6 ___ grade-7____grade- 8 _____

Section-A: Rate the following factors that favor students to drop out in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting on “X” mark in a column you select. Please indicate whether these reasons affected somebody you know.

A=Important B=little important C=Not important

No	Items	Reason for dropout		
		I	LI	NI
2.1	Long distance from home to school			
2.2	Students give less attention for their learning			
2.3	Poor academic performance (fear of failure)			
2.4	Frequent repetition			
2.5	Lack of counseling service when facing a problem (at school level)			
2.6	Frequent absenteeism			
2.7	Unsafe road condition from home to school			
2.8	Shortage of school facilities			
2.9	Use of corporal punishment by school personal			
2.10	Lack of parental encouragement			
2.11	Health problem /sickness			
2.12	Family disunity/family breakdown			
2.13	Parental illness or death(family problem)			
2.14	Frustration during examination			
2.15	Involvement in family work			
2.16	Influence of peer group			
2.17	Lack of educational materials			
2.18	Cultural impact/irritation			
2.19	Families lower standard of living			
2.20	Need to make money by trading chat			

Section-B: Rate the following school based factors that favor students to repeat grade in your school. Based on your judgment put the degree of contribution of each factor by putting ‘X’ mark in a column you select. The choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Key- A=Very High B=High C=Moderate D=Low E=Very Low

No	Items	VH	H	Mo	L	VL
3.1	High number of student learnt in a section					
3.2	Poor infrastructure of the school					
3.3	Lack of text book					
3.4	Suitability of school					
3.5	Un attractive school environment for instructional programs					
3.6	Content loaded curriculum/heavy curriculum					
3.7	Difficulty of language of instruction					
3.8	Teachers frequent absenteeism in classroom instruction					
3.9	Teachers use more time speaking in their teaching method lesson than learners					
3.10	Teachers do not use simplifying teaching method					
3.11	Teachers do not use teaching aid materials, to make students understand their lesson.					
3.12	Poor continuous assessment practice by giving class work, home work, test and project work					
3.13	Poor questioning skill of teachers or unsuitable examination					
3.14	Poor teacher extra support to the students who are in need of it					
3.15	Poor class room management of teachers					
3.16	In appropriate relationship of teachers with their pupils					
3.17	Lack supervision from school managements					
3.18	Poor management of school based students academic support programs such as tutorial and special support for female students					
3.19	Bad working environment due to poor conflict management					
3.20	Involvement of parents and community in management of the school					

3-Interview guide for parents whose children dropout/repeated school.

The researcher will be briefly explain the purpose of the interview, that is the purpose of the interview is to collect information that will help investigating factors related to drop out ,and

repetition of students in selected 2nd level primary schools of west Hararghe zone and telling parents that their honest response is valuable for the success of the study.

Back ground information

Region _____ Zone _____ Woreda _____

PA _____ School _____ Level of the school _____

Age _____ Sex, Male _____ Female _____

Level of Education _____

What is the number of your family members?

Male _____ Female _____ Total _____

What is your position in your family? (a) father (b) mother (c) sister (d) brother (e) Other types of work _____

1. Is there anyone in your family who dropped out of school?

Yes _____ No _____

If your response is yes, from which grade,

Grade -5 _____ grade-6 _____ grade-7 _____ grade-8 _____

Sex-Male _____ Female _____

2. What factors do force your child dropout from the school?

3. In your opinion, what is the most common cause of your school dropout?

(a) Financial (b) broken family (c) child labor (d) health issues (e) other

4. In your opinion, who is responsible for causing 2nd level primary school dropout?

(a) Student themselves (b) Teachers (c) Parents (d) government (e) Others if any _____

5. What are the supports given to let the children back to school to continue his/her education after and before dropout from?

Schools _____

The woreda educational office _____

The local administration _____

6. What reasons have you heard or told about your child to repeat education/grade?
7. What established Mechanisms are undertaken in your locality to improve educational internal efficiency?
8. What is the distance from the school to your home? _____
9. Have you attended any school meeting as a parent? _____
10. Have you got any awareness creation or rising about student dropout and repetition?

4-INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

This interview is intended to help the researcher find out the factors contributing to drop out of pupils and repetition from public primary schools in west Hararghe zone. The information you provided will be used for research purpose only, and will be treated with at most privacy. Please respond to all the questions.

1-What do you understand by the term dropout?

2-Do you have causes of schools dropout and class repetition in your school?

3-What do you think are the major causes of pupils' dropout in your school?

Kindly rank them in order of importance.

4-What do you think are the major causes of pupils class repetition in your school?

5-What gender is mostly affected by school dropout? Please explain.

6-What gender is mostly affected by pupils class repetition? Please explain.

7-Are there school related factors contributing to school dropout? Please explain.

8-Are there school related factors contributing to pupils class repetition? Please explain.

9-What socio-cultural factors contribute to school dropout in this school?

10-What socio-economic factors contribute to school dropout in this school?

11-What do you think is the contribution of chat trading to school dropout?

12-What should be done to hold back the problem of school dropout?

Section F: Suggestions for, to hold back dropout

13-What in your own opinion can the following stakeholders in education do to improve

Participation and completion in primary education?

-Government_____

-Parents_____

-Head teachers_____

-Teachers_____

-Community_____

-Pupils themselves_____

Thank you!!!