AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF STUDENT DROP-OUT IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF JIMMA ZONE

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

BY: TAHIR ABATEMAM

OCTOBER, 2019

JIMMA UNIVRSITY

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF STUDENT DROP-OUT IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF JIMMA ZONE

BY: TAHIR ABATEMAM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

OCTOBER, 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is a result of various contributions and cooperative efforts of many individuals. Since it is not possible to mention all of them, I would like to mention just a few. First and foremost, I am grateful to my Advisor Dr. Desalegn Beyene for his kind guidance and devotion. His scholarly advice, patience, encouragement, tireless effort and concern for accuracy have shaped this study into its present form. Secondly, I extend my sincere gratitude to my internal and external examiner Dr. Mebratu Tafase and Dr. Melsaw Tefera , for their constructive comments throughout the study. Fourthly, my sincere gratitude goes to my wife, Umi Nega, for her tolerance, prayers, tender and passionate love all the time during my studies and her moral support. Last but not least, I express my thanks to the sampled Woreda Education heads, School principals, Teachers and dropout returnee students for their cooperation during data collection process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATION

EFA   Education for All

ESDP   Education Sector Development Program

ETP   Education and Training Policy

MDGs   Millennium Development Goals

MOE   Ministry of Education

UNESCO   United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization

UN   United Nations

UNICEF   United Nations Children's Fund

Abstract

The title of this thesis is an investigation of the causes and consequences of student drop-out in government secondary schools of Jimma Zone. To achieve this objective a concurrent mixed methods design was employed. Data were collected from 78 teachers, 49 dropout returnee students 7 Principals and 3 heads of woreda Education Offices using questionnaire and interview. The school principals and heads of woreda Education Offices were the subjects of interview questions. Simple random sampling (lottery method) was employed to select teachers' respondents and snowball sampling was applied to select the dropout returnee students. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, weight mean, independent sample t-test and multiple regression analysis *whereas qualitative data were* narrated to substantiate the *quantitative data. Moreover, documents of schools and woreda education Offices were consulted to examine the trends and status of dropout rates. Hence, the study revealed that the trends of students' dropout rates in secondary schools of the study area showed a declining tendency and the highest dropout rates were existed in grade nine. The data also showed that the dropout rate is relatively higher among girls than boys in the study area. The analysis to identify the causes of the problem showed that the high rate of students' dropout in the study area is the result of in-school and out-school related factors. The finding showed that 35% of the variation in student dropout factors can be explained. When adjusted R^2 (ΔR^2) is used the model predicts about 34% variation in student dropouts factors. From this, therefore, it is concluded that even though the trends of dropout rate is decreasing for the past consecutive academic years there is still high student dropout in the study area. The key determinants that affected the pupils' decision to drop out of school in the study area were the combination of both in-school and out-of-school factors. Depending on the findings of the study,* early intervention, changing societal attitude, *implementation of poverty reduction strategies, creation of more employment opportunities for students who completed Secondary schools, giving advice to students to spend most of their time on studying rather than wasting their time on household chores, awareness raising on the importance of family planning services, encouraging parental involvement and support and giving awareness to the community on the importance of education were forwarded as recommendations.*

Key Words: An investigation of the causes and consequences of student drop-out in government secondary schools of Jimma Zone.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the issue of drop-out in the context of education and development will be discussed. The background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and definition of terms will also be addressed.

1.1 Background of the Study

In a number of developing countries the term student "dropout" refers to students who have not been able to complete their basic education (Hernandez & Nesman, 2004; Tatafu. 1997; Thaman, 1994).

In contrast, the term dropout has been defined differently in many of the developed countries. For example, according to the American Educational Society, a dropout is someone who is without a high school diploma (Dorn, 1993; Rumberger,1987; Temple, Reynolds, & Miedel; 2000).   Other researchers (Kelly, 1986; Lewit, 1992; Temple *et al*., 2000) have not used an explicit definition to refer to dropout, but rather used words such as 'student elimination', 'withdrawal', and 'early school leaver', interchangeably.

By the same token, some researchers and educators have also wittingly used other terms to refer to "student dropout".   The terms have often been chosen on the basis of researchers' own conceptualizations; for example, the term 'early school leaver' has been used by Christenson, Sinclair, Lehr, and Godber (2001) to refer to a long process of disengagement from school (and not an instantaneous decision). Furthermore, dropout in this case is preceded by indicators of withdrawal (e.g, poor attendance) or unsuccessful school experiences (e.g., academic or behavioral difficulties) that often begin in the early years of schooling. Likewise, the term 'school completion' has been preferred and used by Christenson and Thurlow (2004) as it has a positive orientation and emphasizes on the development of student competencies.

Similarly, other researchers have argued that the term 'student dropout' has a negative connotation as it places the whole blame on the child for dropping out of school rather than looking at the dropout issue in totality. Furthermore, it has also been noted

that educational and school policies are instrumental in causing student to drop out of schools. In such cases, according to Thaman (1994), these students should be referred to as 'push-outs'. The work of Bickel, Bond and LeMahieu (1986) suggests that there is no single definition of 'student dropout' as they note that students who leave school before completion fall into at least three categories: (1) 'dropout' who consciously decide to leave school early for a variety of reasons (for example, disciplinary problems, low achievement, Pregnancy), (2) 'push-out' who perceive the school or its personnel as hostile and (3) 'fade-out', whose decision to leave school does not occur at a particular time and is a less conscious choice. Moreover, Hruska (2005) used the term "dropout" to refer to students who, for any reason except death, leaves school before graduation without transferring to another school/institution. In essence, Hruska's definition is relatively neutral and does not infer to any particular reason as to why students drop out of school. More importantly, this definition also leaves open the different causes (personal, educational, and geographical) that may lead to students dropping out of school. For the present study then, the stipulated definition for 'student dropout' is as follows: Any student who, for any reason, leaves school before completing secondary school without transferring to another secondary school.

With respect to the type of dropout Sappasatta (1993), categorized dropouts into three on the basis of their respective causes for quitting their education. The first one is involuntary dropouts. These are types of dropout that are caused by problem like illness, physical disability, poverty, accident, etc which can exert external influence on students. The second one is retarded dropout. This is a student who could not perform the necessary work required for promotion to the next grade due to lack of sufficient ability to handle academic studies. The third one is the capable dropouts. Such dropouts are characterized by certain personal and emotional factors. As opposed to the retarded dropout, the capable dropouts have abilities of academic performance. They have potential for doing better, but they are dominated by social and psychological problems which are manifested in school (Sappasatta, 1993).

Education is a cornerstone of economic growth and social development and a principal means of improving the welfare of individuals (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991). In this era, education has become a foundation on which countries build their future. Education increases and improves productive capacity, brings about attitudinal change which facilitates the development of the national economy.

Education brings many benefits to both individuals and societies as such; the right to education has been ratified by a succession of UN Conventions, starting from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 to the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989, which received the status of international law in 1990. At the World Education Forum (2000) in Dakar, 164 governments identified six goals to achieve education for all (EFA).

 The Education for All (EFA) movement has resulted in more attention being paid to issues of both participation and completion in education. However, the right to education for all (EFA) has been under serious threat due to continued high numbers of school dropouts, making school retention hard to maintain over the past several years (UNESCO, 2001, 2005, 2012; Wills, Zhao, & Hartwell, 2006).

An important educational milestone for individuals is the completion of secondary education. Secondary education is the form of education children receive after primary education and before the tertiary stage. Secondary education is of four years duration and is given in two stages; Junior Secondary stage and Senior Secondary stage each stage being of two years duration. The problem of secondary school dropout has generated increased interest among researchers, policymakers   and educators in recent years. Many researchers and educators (Auxier, 2003; Harvey, 2001; Hruska, 2005; Tavola, 2000a, 2000b; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000) have recently suggested that dropping out of school is not new, but an ongoing phenomenon that exists in secondary schools. Furthermore, research evidence indicates, that retention in secondary schools is an educational challenge in most countries, ranging from very developed countries to third world countries (Englund *et al*., 2008, Robertson, 2006; Rumberger, 1987; Tavola, 2000b). In essence, despite the differences in secondary education system, dropping out is an international phenomenon.

Moreover, several disadvantages are evident when individuals decide to drop out of school without completing their secondary education (Englund, Egeland & Collins, 2008; Nathan, 2006). In support of this idea, Telaye (1997), says when students drop out of school, sequential school learning cannot occur, subject matter skills cannot be developed, and much student talent is wasted.

Regardless of the cause of students' premature school leaving, the dropout behavior increases wastage of the state resources on education and also creates more problems to the security and social welfare agencies. The problem of dropping-out as one aspect of educational wastage reduces the efficiency of secondary education. Drop out reduces the number of successful graduates and makes the pupil years used by drop-out partially or totally wasted (UNESCO,1984;Tanguiane,1990). While the performance of an educational system is measured by quality and quantity of results (UNESCO, 1983b) dropping-out results in the reduction of the "productivity of formal education" (Tanguiane, 1990 P 54). In light of the aforementioned point, studies on the causes of dropout, particularly of secondary education are important for they may enable concerned authorities take remedial measures and minimize all sorts of inefficiency in the system.

Any inefficiency in secondary education indicates that certain amount of resources (that could be material, financial or human) has been inefficiently used or totally wasted. Quality and efficiency of education at higher level, contribute to the development of the country, and its weaknesses have an equally significant effect.

Conceiving the negative consequences of drop out for society and individuals, facilitating school completion for all students must be a priority for educators, administrators, researchers and policy makers. In Ethiopia, despite the efforts undertaken by government to improve the quality of secondary education , there has been a growing concern throughout the country that many pupils do not complete secondary school education especially in government secondary schools. Thus, a close investigation into the causes of dropout in secondary education has an enormous value. With this general framework, the major aim of the study was to investigate the causes and consequences of student dropout in some selected government secondary schools of Jimma Zone.

UNESCO (2012) global report on education quoted Hendrik van der Pol, UNESCO Institute for Statistics director as saying: "The world has just a few short years to make good on the promise to fulfill every pupil's right to education by 2015. School systems are reaching more pupils but losing them due to inefficiencies, which lead to dropout of school. It is far more difficult and costly to reach students once they leave school than to address the barriers and bottlenecks in the system" (UNESCO, 2012, P.1).

The major concern out of the report is that of global dropout rates, that do not seem to have gone down over the years. In many countries of the world, there are high rates of pupils leaving school, worse in the developing world. Global report on education reported that Sub-Saharan Africa sees 42 % of its pupils leaving school before completion of secondary school. In South and West Asia, out of every 100 pupils who start secondary school, 33 leave before reaching grade 10. While in Latin America and the Caribbean, 17 % of pupils leave school before completing secondary education. South Asian countries, sees 13.54 of its pupils leave school before completing secondary education. Pakistan has the highest rate of dropouts in the region at 38.5 per cent followed by Nepal with 38.3 % and Bangladesh comes third with 33.8 per cent (UNESCO, 2012).

Making secondary education more accessible is a serious challenge in many parts of the world, certainly in sub-Saharan Africa; however, significant increases in the Arab states and sub-Saharan Africa have been made. The Gross Enrolment Ratio, GER, provides with the information that lower secondary education increased from 72 % to 80 % in the world between the years 1999 and 2009. Even though there is a progress in sub-Saharan Africa, the participation rate for this level of education remains at a very low level of 43 %. Another challenge is gender inequality among secondary school students in the region, as sub-Saharan Africa is facing serious gender disparities at the lower secondary level (UNESCO, 2011).

Though the study by Colclough, Rose and Tembon, (2000) found that poverty in Africa appears to have a major influence on the demand for schooling, not only because it affects the inability of households to pay school fees and other costs associated with education, but also because it is associated with a high opportunity cost of schooling for children. As children grow older, the opportunity cost of education is even larger, hence increasing the

pressure for children to work and earn income for the household as opposed to spending time in education. They further found that only when poverty and opportunity cost are compounded by factors such as: poor quality of education provision, inadequate school facilities, overcrowded classrooms, inappropriate language of instruction, teacher absenteeism ,etc dropping out is more likely to occur.

In some countries such as Niger in 2006 and Burkina Faso in 2003 more than one quarter of pupils who started secondary school dropped out. This result reinforces the well known finding by Cameron, (2005) in his study in America that the older the child is, the greater the chances of dropping out of school. This is due to the fact that for older children the opportunity cost of schooling increases significantly creating pressure to work or to get married. Similar studies by Cain, (1977) in Bangladesh and by UNESCO, (2005) also found that older pupils were at a greater risk of dropping out than younger ones. Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC), (2009) findings in 35 countries suggest that there is a strong positive relationship between relative age-in-grade and dropout rates in secondary school. In Malawi, Rwanda and Uganda over age children in school is also a problem, perhaps not as high as in Kenya, but non-completion of secondary school remains relatively high as indicated by the high dropout rate and low completion rate. Late enrollment resulting in pupils being overage for their grade level is seen as a major factor influencing pupil dropout on the African continent.

High dropping out of students from schools has been one of the main challenges of the education system of Ethiopia in general, and secondary schools in particular. For instance, the MOE data of 2010 showed that more than 17% of school age students of general secondary education were dropped out from the schools. The trend analysis for drop out showed a decline tendency from 2003 to 2005. It might be the government measures such as increase budget allocation to education, construction of new schools, recruiting and training of teachers and the like to reduce drop out (FDRE, 2004). Nevertheless, dropout rates began again started to show an increasing trends from 2006 to 2009 (MOE & UNICEF, 2012). MOE 2010 data also showed that dropout trend of general secondary school students of Oromia region, had also high rates of drop out, nearly the national average (16.6%). Supporting this, UNESCO (2015) revealed that one of the critical problems of the Ethiopia's education sector is a high dropout rate almost at all levels.

Several factors were mentioned associated with students' dropout in Ethiopia. Previous studies conducted on primary schools and female students drop out (Zehle, 2009; Maeregu & Tadesse ,2015; Habtamu, 2002 and MOE and UNICEF ,2012) revealed that several personal, school and family related factors contributed to students' dropout. Some of the factors mentioned comprise ill-health, malnutrition, low students interest to education, low employment opportunities to graduates, teachers' methods of teaching, range of costs associated with schooling like uniform, travel, equipment and students' opportunity costs

Jimma zone is found in the South western part of Oromia region. The Zone has 69 government secondary schools. Jimma zone, like other Zones in the region, has experienced large numbers of pupils dropping out of school for various reasons. According to Jimma Zone Education Office annual statistical abstract of 2017, over a thousand Secondary school pupils dropout of school each year. The zone recorded about 3500 dropouts between 2016 and 2017. This shows the magnitude of the problem of school dropout. Consequently, this study investigated the causes and consequences of student dropout in some selected government secondary schools of Jimma zone.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The reason why I am interested to conduct study on the problem of school drop-out is that I have been working as a Principal of one Secondary School in Jimma Zone, Mencho

Woreda for 5 years (from 2006-2010 E.C). One of the most difficult situations I encountered while working in that school was the problem of drop-outs. We felt helpless when students stopped coming to school. The reasons varied. Whatever they were, in most cases we were unable to bring those students back to school. This initiated me to conduct study on this topic. The researcher selected Jimma Zone as it is the residential area of the researcher.

It is widely accepted fact that the most relevant indicator of educational efficiency is not just the number of students enrolled in the system but the number of graduates who have completed a given educational level within intended time and with required learning skills attitude and knowledge (UNESCO, 1998). However, a contentious issue in Ethiopia in general and in Jimma Zone in particular is that despite the efforts of the government and other stakeholders towards retaining all students in school, the student dropout rate is still high. Many people especially parents, school principals, teachers and the society in general have expressed concern about the increasing number of school dropout in secondary school level. For example, in Ethiopia, the 2018 educational statistics show that the aggregate dropout rate was 17 %.

The problem of dropping out as one aspect of educational wastage reduces the efficiency of secondary education. Dropout reduces the number of successful graduates and makes the peoples year used by dropout partially or totally wasted (UNESCO, 1984; Tanguiane, 1990). School dropout undermine efforts to achieve the goal of education for all and another to keep pupils enrolled in school.

The realization of these and other educational objective will be difficult if dropout persists. Furthermore, school dropout jeopardizes the efficiency of educational system. When the rate is high, it implies low level of internal efficiency and vice versa . It is also one of the major social and educational problems as it results in poor cost effectiveness and seriously hammer the efforts towards achieving the goal of education for all (Adane, 1993). In particular, the threat would be more acute to students learning in government schools. This is mainly because most of these students come relatively from the low income family. Rumberger and Thomas (2000) also wrote that private schools usually have lower dropout rates than state schools (Frymier, 1996).

Therefore, the problem of dropping out should be the concern of every member of society since it has negative consequences both at individual and societal level. For instance, for society dropout resulted in wastage of scarce resources (teachers who are employed and students time) (Koskei, Tonui and Simiyu, 2015). Dropout has also adverse effect on nation progress by jeopardizing human capital formation needed for economic development. As to Azzam (2007) the major social costs of dropout of school include reduced political participation, increased demand for social services, increased crime rate and poor level of health. Individual students also suffer negatively from dropping out of school. On average, youth who are dropping out are more likely to experience future unemployment, engage in crime, underemployment and lower earnings (Thurton, Collins and Daugherty, 2006). On the whole, the society is affected with the criminals that drop away from schools. It is therefore, necessary to find ways or means of curbing the situation.

In Jimma Zone, there has been high number of student dropout in government secondary school level. For instance, out of 22,310 students enrolled in grade 9-10 in 2010 E.C, 1,541 students left school. Similarly, in 2011E.C out of 29,354 students enrolled in grade 9-10 1,926 dropped out of secondary schools. (Jimma Zone Education Office Annual Report, 2011 E.C).

Though reasons for dropout are many and depends on the context and the individuals, the study area is generally characterized by wastage particularly in terms of dropout. Many schools have now become functionally ineffective and deserted due to mass student truancy, lateness, absenteeism and withdrawal. There is limited empirical evidence to discern the factors that are responsible for the high dropout rate in Jimma zone.

In fact, policy measures to reduce students' dropout cannot be successfully designed unless reasons for dropout are known (Elsemon, 1997). Therefore, this thesis tried to fill such gaps by investigating the causes and consequences of student dropout in government secondary schools of Jimma Zone. In order to address this issue, the researcher dealt with the following basic questions:

1. What is the status of student dropout in Government Secondary Schools of Jimma Zone?

2. What are the key determinants of pupils' decision to drop out of school in Secondary Schools of Jimma Zone?

2.1 What are the major in-school related factors that contribute to dropout of pupils in Jimma Zone Government Secondary Schools?

2.2 What are the major out of school related factors which contribute to dropout of pupils in Jimma Zone Government Secondary Schools?

3. What are the consequences of student dropout of school?

1.3 Objectives of the study

The study was conducted with the aim of attaining the following objectives:

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of this study is to investigate the causes and consequences of student dropout in government Secondary Schools of Jimma Zone.

1.3.2 Specific objective

1. Study the status of student dropout in Jimma Zone Secondary schools.
2. Assess the major in-school related factor that influence dropout of pupils.
3. Study the major out of school related factors which influence dropout of pupils.
4. Assess the consequences of student dropout of school.

1.4. Significance of the Study

First, it cultivates a sense of awareness on the cause and consequences of students' dropout to principals, teachers, parents and other stake holders. Furthermore, the findings of this study generates better understanding of the student dropout issue pertaining to the case study schools as well as schools in similar context in Jimma Zone. Another significance of this study is that it helps to establish a premise for determining which factors are most related to the cause of students' dropout. Finally, the issues discussed in this study will help other researchers who have the intention to conduct research on similar area.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

Even though the problem of student dropout is an issue which is undermining the efficiency of primary and secondary schools in Jimma zone, the researcher is forced to delimit the scope of the study to government first cycle secondary schools of Jimma Zone (grade 9-10) in order to make it feasible and manageable; and to conduct it with available resources within the limited time given. The reason why the study is delimited to government secondary schools is that it is widely recognized that the problem of school dropout is more acute in government secondary schools than those owned privately or by different nongovernmental organizations.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

While the researcher was trying to investigate the causes and consequences of students' dropout, it is vital to be sure of getting the subjects who quit schooling because of various reasons. Hence, non- returnee dropout students were not included because it is difficult to find them. In the same manner, the parents of non- returnee dropout students were not included in the study owing to time constraints and long walking distances to reach such parents. Consequently, dropout returnee students, their teachers, school directors and Heads of the selected woreda education offices were included in the study.

1.7. Operational Definition of Terms

Dropout: this refers to a student who due to some reason is unable to complete his/her secondary school course, and therefore has to abandon schooling prematurely.

Wastage: is the combined result of repetition and dropouts.

Woreda: is a region/district marked off for administrative purpose.

1.8. Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, Objectives of the study, significance of the study, Delimitation of the study, Limitation of the Study and operational definition of terms used in the thesis. The second chapter deals with review of related literature and the third chapter presents the research design and methodology while the forth chapter deals with

presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. Finally, summary, conclusions and recommendations are covered in the fifth chapter. Besides, references and appendixes are attached at the end of the thesis.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter deals with review of related literature on student dropout. The chapter also discusses the concept of student dropout, causes of student dropout, consequences of student dropout, theoretical framework and conceptual framework of the study.

2.1 The Concept of Student Dropout

Widespread concern over a commonly recognized student dropout problem appeared only in the late 1950's and early 1960's in the United States (Dorn, 1993). This varied for other developing countries who were more concerned with providing basic primary education then. However, today both the developing and the developed countries are acknowledging the serious problem of student dropout. In a number of developing countries the term student "dropout" refers to students who have not been able to complete their basic education (Hernandez & Nesman, 2004; Tatafu. 1997; Thaman, 1994).

In contrast, the term dropout has been defined differently in many of the developed countries. For example, according to the American Educational Society, a dropout is someone who is without a high school diploma (Dorn, 1993; Rumberger,1987; Temple, Reynolds, & Miedel; 2000).   Other researchers (Kelly, 1986; Lewit,1992; Temple *et al*., 2000) have not used an explicit definition to refer to dropout, but rather used words such as 'student elimination', 'withdrawal', and 'early school leaver', interchangeably.

By the same token, some researchers and educators have also wittingly used other terms to refer to "student dropout".   The terms have often been chosen on the basis of researchers' own conceptualizations; for example, the term 'early school leaver' has been used by Christenson, Sinclair, Lehr, and Godber (2001) to refer to a long process of disengagement from school (and not an instantaneous decision). Furthermore, dropout in this case is preceded by indicators of withdrawal (e.g, poor attendance) or unsuccessful school experiences (e.g., academic or behavioral difficulties) that often begin in the

early years of schooling. Likewise, the term 'school completion' has been preferred and used by Christenson and Thurlow (2004) as it has a positive orientation and emphasizes on the development of student competencies.

Similarly, other researchers have argued that the term 'student dropout' has a negative connotation as it places the whole blame on the child for dropping out of school rather than looking at the dropout issue in totality. Furthermore, it has also been noted that educational and school policies are instrumental in causing student to drop out of schools. In such cases, according to Thaman (1994), these students should be referred to as 'push-outs'. The work of Bickel, Bond and LeMahieu (1986) suggests that there is no single definition of 'student dropout' as they note that students who leave school before completion fall into at least three categories: (1) 'dropout' who consciously decide to leave school early for a variety of reasons (for example, disciplinary problems, low achievement, Pregnancy), (2) 'push-out' who perceive the school or its personnel as hostile and (3) 'fade-out', whose decision to leave school does not occur at a particular time and is a less conscious choice. Moreover, Hruska (2005) used the term "dropout" to refer to students who, for any reason except death, leaves school before graduation without transferring to another school/institution. In essence, Hruska's definition is relatively neutral and does not infer to any particular reason as to why students drop out of school. More importantly, this definition also leaves open the different causes (personal, educational, and geographical) that may lead to students dropping out of school. For the present study then, the stipulated definition for 'student dropout' is as follows: Any student who, for any reason, leaves school before completing secondary school without transferring to another secondary school.

2.2 Causes of Drop-out

A number of studies attempt to examine causes of student drop-out. UNESCO ROEAP's workshop on drop-out (1987) grouped the causes in into 'student- and home-related' and 'school- and school-system-related causes.

2.2.1 Student- and Home-related Causes

a) Financial Causes

A number of studies state the relationship between the rates of drop-out and financial problems, such as, poverty, low income, or irregular/seasonal pattern of income as a major cause of drop-out (Brimer and Pauli 1971,Schiefelbein and Farrell 1978, Rumberger 1987, Singh 1989, Taylor 1989, Wechsler and Oakland 1990, Kirui 1982, Patrinos and Psacharopoulos 1992, Palmer 1993, Martin 1994,Ghana UNICEF/MOE 1994 and others). The study in China revealed that the drop-out rate was inversely proportional to the average per capita annual income of the area (UNESCO ROEAP 1984, 1990).

Davison (1993), in his analysis of drop-out in Kenya and Malawi, observes that 90% of drop-out is for financial reasons. Financial reasons are linked with the educational expenses incurred. Many children drop out of school because they themselves or their parents are not able to meet the necessary expenses. Kortering et al. (1992) found that children from welfare-receiving families were at risk. A number of studies show that low income group are more likely to drop out both in industrialized and developing countries (Davio 1990, Wechsler and Oakland 1990).

On the other hand, some studies show that school attendance does not necessarily correspond to income level (Ghana 1989). Hanushek and Lavy (1994) also point out that it is parents' inability to pay but not low income itself which leads to children leaving school. A closer examination of studies reveals the difference between income and parents' ability or willingness to pay. Therefore, low income could be compensated for by parents' positive attitude towards schooling and willingness to pay. Financial causes can be related to parental attitudes in order to measure the effect more accurately.

Low income has more serious effect on girls (Floro and Wolf 1990, Tietjen 1991, Chamie 1983, Hon 1991 and others). Davison and Kanyuka (1993) found that school fees were more problematic for girls than boys in southern Malawi. Financial difficulties are also related to a government's educational policies, such as introduction of user charges. Samaroo (1991) considers that lack of political will is responsible for causing drop-outs by

making school attendance too expensive for the economically disadvantaged groups in society.

b) Parental Attitude

Parental attitudes are also reported to have a link with drop-out (Jamison and Lockheedv1987, Omari et al. 1982, Safihos-Rothchild and Whyte 1986, Davison 1993) and parents' education is similarly linked (Ilon and Moock 1991, Jamison and Lockheed 1987). These studies explain that parental education has a significant influence in their attitudes towards schooling, as educated parents are likely to value education more than parents with little or no formal education.

Parents themselves recognize their responsibilities and blame themselves. In a survey in rural Malawi, 38.6% of fathers and 27.0% of mothers responded that negative and uninterested attitude of parents towards educating girls is the most significant cause of dropping out (Davison and Kanyuka, 1993). A number of studies cite 'parental ignorance' or 'parents' disinterest in school', but the same studies give little attention to parents' observations on the quality of education. It might not always be the lack of understanding of education, but their accurate evaluation of the schooling which makes them lose interest in available education.

c) Work and Household Chores

Work and household chores can be causes of drop-out (Mbunda 1983, Omani et al. 1982, Cann 1982, Palmer 1993). In a household with low income, childrens' earnings are also necessary and this hinders school attendance. Some children are expected to provide labor in the family business (Omani et al. 1982) as well as helping farming (UNESCO ROEAP 1984, 1987).

Household chores tend to affect girls more than boys, reflecting parental attitudes. In addition to working for the family business, girls are expected to carry out household chores and child rearing. A study in Ghana shows that a large sibling size has a negative impact on girl's education, since elder sisters are expected to rear the younger siblings (Lloyd and Gage-Brandon 1994).

d) Gender

Gender is one of the significant factors in drop-out. In most countries rates of drop-out among girls are higher than those among boys. However, the pattern is not uniform. In Bangladesh the average drop-out rate among girls was considerably higher than that among boys throughout primary and secondary education. In China, the drop-out rate of girls was higher than that of boys in primary school, but the pattern was reversed in junior secondary school. Sri Lanka showed a slightly different pattern of drop-out from other countries. It had an average grade-wise drop-out rate of girls (1.7%) lower than for boys (2.1%), although the difference is rather small. When the gross enrolment rates are high the gender disparity decreases (UNESCO ROEAP, 1987). However, in Zimbabwe despite its high enrolment rates, girls' drop-out rates are high both in primary and secondary education (Atkinson et al. 1993).

Pregnancy and early marriage are gender-related dominant causes of drop-out from second level education and the later stage of primary education (Obe, 1980, Alhassan, 1991, Kirui 1982, Ciano 1982, Mbunda, 1983, Duncan, 1988, Davison, 1993). In Zimbabwe, upper primary drop-outs due to pregnancy are reported to have been increasing in recent years (Zimbabwe 1993, 1994). Alhassan (1991) in his study in Nigeria observes that Muslim girls' drop-out rate is high due to early marriage. As has been seen, other factors, such as low income, household chores and large sibling size, have more negative effect on girls' education than on boys'.

e) Over-age

A number of studies state that over-aged pupils/students are more likely to drop out than those who enrolled in appropriate age (UNESCO ROEPA 1987, Ilon and Moock 1991). Over-aged pupils tend to have difficulties in adjustment. The problem is less evident in junior grades, where being over-age could be an advantage. On the other hand, in senior grades over-aged students are more likely to have difficulties in adjusting to peers and the schooling process.

Age/grade distortion is greater in rural areas in developing countries; over-age and low family income are also strongly related (Patrinos and Psacharopoulos 1992, Ilon 1991).

15

Over-age is a result of late-entry, repetition or interruption of schooling. In a study carried out in Peru, enrolment in appropriate age was positively associated with family income and negatively associated with school costs (Hon and Moock 1991). Glewwe and Jaccoby (1992) found that over-age was associated with a number of negative factors such as increased opportunity cost, lack of school places and malnutrition.

f) Learning Difficulties

A number of studies state students' low academic achievement (Singh 1989, Kirui 1982) as causes of dropping out. Abilities in reading (Kortering et al 1992) and mathematics (Singh 1989), as well as learning style (Svec 1990), are said to be associated with dropout. These factors may result from the children's ability and readiness to learn as well as from other factors related to the education process and environment. Verhine and Melo (1988) and Schiefelbein (1992) also found that students with learning difficulties are also at risk of leaving school early.

Students' loss of interest in school (Bray 1984, Ciano 1982) or lack of motivation and achievement (Dohn 1990) are all associated with lower academic achievement and dropping out.

While it seems rational to connect low academic achievement and drop-out, some studies are more careful. Low academic achievement can be the result of loss of interest through inappropriate learning content, ineffective teaching style, or other school factors. Low income can bring about school absenteeism from the need to work, which could also result in students' low academic performance. When socioeconomic backgrounds are controlled, significant difference in cognitive functioning is not observed among students (Fine 1986, Svec 1990).

g) Ethnicity/Cultural Minority

Student drop-out in multi-racial/cultural societies has a strong relationship with ethnicity. A number of studies emphasise the high drop-out rates among the minority groups in the USA (Rumberger, 1990, Committee for Economic Development, 1987, Wehlage et al., 1989). Svec, (1990) observed that the high rate of drop-out was associated with ethnicity and poverty much more than academic performance, suggesting that the link between the high

drop-out rate and ethnic affiliation should be treated carefully. Otrozco, (1989) presents empirical data illustrating lower drop-out rates among the recent immigrant minorities than the long-staying minorities of Hispanic origin. The association of ethnicity and drop-out is reported in studies in other countries, such as Asian immigrants in Danish schools (Boset al., 1990), the indigenous population in Guatemala and Bolivia (Patrinosand Psacharopoulos 1992), and Maori in New Zealand (Meiji, 1994).

Medium of instruction is an important factor affecting earlier drop-out (UNESCO ROEAP, 1987, Eon, 1991). Students might not be able to learn through an unfamiliar language and this could lead them to lose interest in schooling or to lower their academic performance, eventually leading them to abandon schooling.

2.2.2 School- and School-system-related Causes

a) Teachers

The teachers' role is identified as a strong factor linked to drop-out (Odebunmi 1983, Verhine and Melo 1988, Davico 1990, Davison and Kanyuka 1992). Teachers play a significant role in raising students' academic motivation (Davison 1993). Teaching quality is often questioned. A lack of trained teachers results in low level performance of students (UNESCO 1982). Verhine and Melo (1988) focused on teacher qualification and their teaching. They concluded that in rural schools teachers were often less qualified than in urban schools and they often did not follow the specified curriculum. In a study in Liberia, half of the teachers in rural primary and secondary schools had only a high school education or less (Coleman and Elman 1983).

Teachers' morale is another problem. Carr-Hill (1984) observes in a study of primary and secondary schools in Tanzania that teachers' working and living conditions were quite unfavorable; a considerable number of them had to supplement their income with other work. Carranza (1984) focus on the role of teachers in retention of students in high schools; teachers' social adjustment as well as their recent experience, their performance and mobility, were found to be associated with the retention rates.

Student/teacher ratio also matters. Many schools in developing countries are overcrowded and numerous rural schools are one-teacher schools of multiple grades (UNESCO 1984,

17

1987). Martin (1994) condemns the educational efficiency approach which causes financial cuts to education in developing countries. Teacher performance and teacher-student relations suffer under constrained economic conditions and in turn can lead to high drop-out rates. Bray (1984) introduces a teacher's perspective which might prefer academically disadvantaged students to leave his/her class in order to raise the academic standard of the class, or simply to reduce the number of students from an overcrowded class.

Teachers' negative attitudes and performance can have adverse effects on students. Punishment (Ghana Ministry of Education 1993) is cited as a cause for drop-out. On the other hand, lack of discipline (Ciano 1982) is also reported to cause drop-out. Davico (1990), in an analysis of teachers and their relations with drop-outs in Brazilian secondary schools, notes that teachers often expect low income students to fail and in turn produce failure through inattention and biased attitudes towards these children.

Female teachers are a role model for female students to continue schooling, and lack of female teachers discourages girls from continuing their schooling (UNESCO 1986). Moreover, under certain religious and cultural circumstances, instruction by male teachers can cause female students to leave school. Some parents may refuse to have their adolescent daughters taught by male teachers (Safilios-Rothchild and Whyte.1986).

b) Educational Facilities

Inadequate educational facilities are also reasons why many children do not learn effectively (Omani 1982, Cann 1982) and they lead to grade repetition and dropping out. Hanushek and Lavy (1994) assert that school quality matters. When students' ability is constant, low quality schools tend to have higher repetition and drop-out.

c) Curriculum/Educational System

The irrelevant content of education is also a problem causing drop-out. Perera (1981) observes that developing countries are struggling to maintain and expand imported systems of education sometimes unrelated to their cultures and unresponsive to their needs. Rural populations are further disadvantaged. Often the curriculum is not appropriate for the majority of the rural population. Education is predominantly urban biased and rural students suffer from this bias (UNESCO 1982). Arnova (1984) also criticizes a foreign model of

educational system which is elitist and examination-oriented and does not necessarily meet the economic needs of the population.

d) School/Community Gap

The gap between the school and community is recognized as a source of the failure for children from these communities. Incompatibility between school and home environment is one of the major causes of dropout which is evident in early grades (UNESCO, 1993). For example, if the medium of instruction differs from the language used at home, children have a great burden to adjust at school.

e) Lack of Employment

Lack of employment can cause students to leave school early when they realise that their aspired occupation does not materialize as a result of schooling (Mbunda 1983). Schooling does not guarantee employment in the formal sector. The sight of many unemployed school graduates may discourage students from continuing schooling. Education is considered as a road out of poverty (Weis 1985), but the low income group may not wish to invest in education when they realise the return is uncertain. Lack of connection between jobs and schooling is a cause; semi-skilled jobs common in rural areas do not necessarily require academic education and people lose interest in school (Gedge 1991).

f) Distance from School

Physical access to school can also hinder a child's enrollment, especially girls' and younger children's. The excessive distance to the school and no provision of transport may result in irregular attendance (Bray 1984, Cann 1982). Infrastructure, especially in rural areas, and the number of schools available, are often blamed. Lavy (1991) observes that the distance to the school has a strong effect on the initial decision to attend school but do not have any effect on school continuation on the survey of primary schools in Ghana. In addition to topographic characteristics (UNESCO ROEAP 1987), natural disasters and political situations can affect communities and prevent children continuing their schooling. In Zimbabwe severe drought experienced in 1992 increased the number of drop-outs, especially in rural areas (Zimbabwe 1994). The drop-out rates also increased in security sensitive areas (Zimbabwe 1991).

g) School related Expenses

One of the most frequently described causes is school determined expenses. Various expenses for uniforms, pens and books are a burden for families with low income and can cause drop-out (e.g. Davison and Kanyuka 1993, and Moock 1991, Kirui 1982, Odebunmi 1983, Duncan 1988).

2. 3. Consequences of Student Dropout

A theoretical examination of the literature also suggests that student dropout is a pressing concern not only for parents and teachers, but also for the society as a whole. Researchers (Englund *et al*., 2008; Rumberger, 1987; Rumberger & Thomas,2000; Tavola, 2000b) have strongly argued, for instance, that education is associated with good life opportunities, and those individuals who are deprived of an education are disadvantaged throughout their lives. Furthermore, the consequence of student dropout is detrimental to the government revenues (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006; Englund *et al*., 2008; Harvey, 2001; Nathan, 2006). In this analysis, with the impact of globalization the current workforce is dictated by technological advances and complexities that were nonexistent in past agrarian and industrial societies (Harvey, 2001). Today's employment expectations and opportunities require a workforce that is advanced in skill development. In general, many students who drop out early do not have the required skills to assist them in the workforce. Likewise, research evidence (Katie, 2007; Hruska, 2005; Harvey, 2001; Rumberger, 1987) indicates that unemployment, arising from student dropout, is analogous to poverty and crime.

2.3.1 National Concern

The prevalence of high dropout rates not only imperils individuals' future but also profoundly affects our communities and the nation. Student dropout became a national concern in early 1960's when industrialized countries such as the United States, England, and Canada realized the important socio-economic implications behind this social and school problem. Several studies have since then (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006; Englund *et al*., 2008; Harvey, 2001; Nathan, 2006) noted the repercussions of student dropout, including the loss of productive workers and the earnings and revenues they would have generated, and the higher cost associated with increased incarceration,

health care, and social service. Macro-level examinations of student dropout effects have found, in general, that student dropout leads to socio-economic problems, such as lower tax revenues and increased expenditures for governmental assistance programs (Catterall, 1985; Harvey, 2001; Nathan, 2006). In the United States, for example, the total lifetime costs incurred for each individual who drops out of high school ranged from US$243,000 to US$388,000 (Englund *et al*., 2008). Furthermore, the lifetime cost to the nation for each youth who drops out of school and later moves into a life of crime and drugs ranges from $1.7 to $2.3 million (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006).

Analogous to industrialized countries, according to school advocacy groups in British Columbia, one in every seven students who drops out of school receives social assistance within 18 months of leaving school, and 90% of criminal justice expenditures are associated with dropout. In essence research studies (Catterall, 1985; Harvey, 2001; Nathan, 2006) have suggested that, in general, the expenditure related to a child completing secondary school education is much less than the costs that are concerned with welfare, incarceration and unemployment. Lower tax revenues are the most obvious consequences of student dropout (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006; Englund *et al*., 2008); even when students who drop out are employed, they earn significantly lower wages than those who have completed their secondary schooling. The nation as a whole also suffers when they have less-educated populaces, with the implications includes employing expatriates to work locally (Bridgeland & DiLulio, 2006; Raphael, 2004). Furthermore countries also spend extensively on social and educational welfare programs that would, in turn, cater those youths who are unemployed or/and have committed juvenile crimes.

In Ethiopia, addressing student dropout has been high on the agenda of the Ethiopian government believing that preventing dropout and encouraging successful completion of secondary school can enhance economic growth and social development. It can ensure that students graduate with at least the minimum qualifications needed for economic labor market and for further education and training. Thus, ministry of education planned to reduce dropout and repetition rate of general secondary education and expand general secondary schools in view of its universalization by 2020 in line with the middle income country vision (MOE, 2010b). However high dropping out of students from schools has

21

been one of the main challenges of the education system of Ethiopia in general and secondary schools in particular. For instance, the MOE data 2010 showed that more than 17% of school age students of general secondary education dropped out from the schools. MOE data 2010 also showed that dropout trend of general secondary school students of Oromia region, had also high rates of dropout nearly the national average (16.8%). Supporting this UNESCO (2015) revealed that one of the critical problems of the Ethiopian Education sector is a high dropout rate almost at all levels.

2.3.2   Occupation and Economic Perspectives

The problems of student dropout have become an issue interms of technological innovations and the requirements needed for the workplace. During the 1970s, obtaining a high school diploma was considered an adequate, but not an essential asset for entering the labor market in many industrialized countries. Since then, technological advances such as the internet have placed strong demand for a more highly skilled work force. Today, employers are requiring that school leavers with secondary school qualifications w h o have strong communication skills, mathematics and reading skills, computer skills, problem-solving and critical thinking skills, and the ability to work collaboratively (Laird, Kienzl, Debell, & Chapman, 2007). Consistent with this view, other researchers (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006) have argued that dropping out of school is a precarious decision for a student, especially in this industrialization and technological age.

Given the ongoing technological advances of our societies, it is becoming increasingly harder for young people without proper secondary school qualifications to get work. This problem, in turn, is one of the major factors that contribute to high rates of unemployment. Similar statistics and situations have also been reported elsewhere; for example, in the United States, where the unemployment rate is 33% for those individuals who dropped out of secondary school in 2004-2005 (U. S. Department of Labor, 2006). Many researchers and education advocates (Katie, 2007; Rumberger,1987; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000) have agreed that school dropouts face an uphill battle in the labour market, their chances are slim given the fierce competitiveness of societies.

While all school dropouts are not unemployed, some researchers (Katie, 2007; Hruska, 2005; Harvey, 2001; Rumberger, 1987) have also argued that students who drop out

often lack the critical skills that are essential for the labor market. Consequently, many of these dropouts limit themselves and their families by having low-skill and low-paid jobs. Research findings (Laird *et al*., 2007; Rumberger, 1987) have revealed that there is a great disparity between the earnings of those who drop out of school early, and the earnings of those who have higher educational attainments. For instance, currently in the United States, individuals who graduate from high school earn on average 1.5 times more than those who drop out early; likewise, individuals who hold a college degree earn 2.7 times more than those who drop out (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005).

In other parts of the world, especially in developing countries such as Ethiopia, the problem of child labour is becoming prevalent (Ali, 2007; Singh, 2007a). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) defines child labour as any kind of work which hinders a child from going to school to complete his or her education, or which prevents him/her from developing morally and spiritually (Singh, 2007a). This is a contentious issue; one could argue, for instance, that some children drop out voluntarily so that they could work to assist their poor families (Ali, 2007, Singh,2007b), and likewise some children may have to enter the labor force because they have dropped out of school altogether. For whatever reason it may be, it is sufficed to say that both school dropout and child labor are interrelated to each other.

In addition to lower lifetime earnings, dropping out of school has broader economic implications (Bridgeland, Dilulio, & Morison, 2006; Rumberger, 1987). There are many challenges faced by adolescents who drop out of school early. The bleak future and the limited opportunities that they face have often led to feelings of discontentment, disappointment, and yearning.

2.3.3   Social Problems

Student dropout, according to scholars (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006; Malefoasi,2005, Thornberry, Moore, & Christenson, 1985), also results in many social problems, such as adolescent suicide, drug abuse, sexually transmitted diseases, vandalism, crime, prostitution, and other illegal social activities. Dorn (1993) has argued that without the proper skills to get a job, many dropouts become destructive, anti-social, and rebellious. Further to this testament is the notion that a high proportion of these dropouts become

23

gangsters, hoodlums, drug addicts, and single-sex parents (Alliance for Excellence Education,2007; Rangel & Maeyer, 2008; Save the Children Fiji Report, 2006). For instance, the Save the Children Fiji Report in 2006a revealed that a lack of access to education and employment was the major reason for the large number of teenage prostitutes and street kids. Similarly, a research study conducted in the Solomon Islands (Malefoasi,2005) indicates that 75% of individuals, aged between 15 to 29 yrs, are depressed and often indulge themselves in alcohols, drugs, suicide, sexual activities, and violence because they have left schools early. From an international perspective, dropouts make up a disproportionate higher percentageof the prison population; for instance, 75% in the United States, 87% in Canada, 70% in England, 50% Rumania, 75% in Brazil (Bridgeland *et al*., 2006; Rangel, & Maeyer,2008).

2.4Theoretical Framework

Numerous educational studies have marked it evident that the term dropout is a complex problem to which there is no simple definition attended to it, not solution made to it. How a writer or an investigator defines and perceives the rabble degree, determines the outcome of the study as this reflects the underlying attitude, values and assumptions of the person. Broadly classified with the acceptance of an inevitable overlap, theories of dropout can be classified into these three categories:

i) Administrative theories

ii) Sociological theories

iii) Psychological theories

2.4.1 Administrative Theories

Theories in this category, according to Melhotra. (1975) defines the dropout as students who are no longer in a school after enrolment. Dropouts are thus seen as a loss because enrollment is associated with income for private institutions and revenue allocation for public schools whose income derives from state appropriation which are usually allocated in direct proportion to enrollments data. The major concern of the administrative theories of dropout is with keeping enrollment figures up-going. The emphasis of the view is often demographic headcount and the attribute of dropping out mainly to students' socio-personal

deficiencies and deprivations. Advocate of this view hardly if ever, directly blame or see failure in schools, hence they emphasize compensatory programs to salvage student's deficiencies.

2.4.2   Sociological Theories

These theories see the dropout not only as a product of social dynamics, but also as a problem and catalyst of other social problem. To these theories, the dropout, as a person, symbolizes social inequality, economic disparities, racial segregation, and political disadvantageousness. Hence, dropout researchers that have the sociological approach often emphasized sexual, racial, socio-economic and rural differences. The implication of the dropout phenomenon to youths were unemployment and the congestion of employment market, the cost of welfare suspends, the probable increases insecurity problems, delinquency, social control, vandalism, the general loss of talent, the overall political implications to the powers that are also minored in their writings. The implicit belief of this approach is that the length of school life, preferred by a boy and his parents is shorter his social class. They contend that the individual child's home-background characterized by parental occupation, size of family, value and materials climate of home environment exercise significant influences on decisions to stay or leave school.

2.4.3 Psychological Theories

Researches with psychological approaches to the dropout issue are divers. Some see it as person-environment incongruity, others see it as a consequence of achievement, motivation and levels of career aspiration. Yet some pursue the psychoanalytic approach to conceive the issue as a product of personal, mental and emotional conflicts. (Lichter et al., 1962) which instill "Self-defeating behavior". It is writers psychological bias in their analysis that constitute the bulk of retention who advocate a change in school processes in order to accommodate students diversity in socio-political characteristics. Such studies see things from the students' view point. According to Lichter et al (1962, p.55), "Young men and women who are coaxed and wheeled into going to college – youngsters who are not academically oriented, who do learn well under the circumstances provided by the typical University, with its highly formalized system of abstract instructions, course requirements credit structures, and the like, or whose career aspirations actually call for an entirely

different background than that provided by our colleges and universities (dropouts). For students such as these, the decision to leave college may represents a constructive, meaningful life. The error will have occurred in the selection of a college of Education in the first place". One important belief of these theories, in addition to the succinct representation above, is that the decision to dropout of school is not a sudden compulsive act. Dropout decisions are ultimate of a life-long process of liter action between the students' socio-personal characteristics, academic and social system of the school. Among others are lateness, truancy and absenteeism which start gradually before finally he/she dropouts. All the three categories of theories thus analyzed are not mutually exclusive. They overlap one another not only in their value for educational administration, counseling, reform and social engineering, but also in some technical aspects such as research methodology, interpretation and theoretical orientation. The complexity of the dropout problem makes itself more manifest as a typical social problem and phenomenon that derives its meaning and worth according to value system of the concerned.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the research design and methodology employed in the study. Thus, design of the study, method, sources of data, population, sampling technique and sample size, instruments of data collection, pilot testing, validity, reliability, variables of the study, procedures of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical considerations were discussed in this chapter.

3.1 Design of the Study

Research design is a detailed plan which shows how a research was undertaken (Weitzman & Lohfeld, 2009). It provides an overall plan for collecting data to answer the research questions. It is a blueprint for the collection and analysis of data and includes an outline of what the researcher has done from the beginning up to the final analysis of the data (Kothari, 2004).

Among the types of mixed research designs, a concurrent mixed methods design was employed with the intention of investigating the causes and consequences of students' dropout in Government secondary schools of Jimma Zone. The purpose of a concurrent mixed methods design is to simultaneously collect both quantitative and qualitative data, merge the data and use the results to understand a research problem (Cress well, 2012). Thus, the researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data, analyzed both datasets separately and compared the results from the analysis of both datasets and made an interpretation as to whether the results support or contradict each other .

 A basic rationale for this design was that one data collection form supplies strengths to offset the weaknesses of the other form and that a more complete understanding of a research problem results from collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. In addition to this, quantitative scores on an instrument from many individuals provide strengths to offset the weaknesses of qualitative documents from a few people. Alternatively, qualitative in-depth   interview of a few people offers strength to quantitative data that does not

adequately provide detailed information about the context in which individuals provide information (Cress well, 2012).

3.2 Method

To achieve the purpose of this study the researcher used mixed methods approach because mixed approach as a methodology incorporates multiple approaches in all stages of research from problem identification to research questions, data collection, and data analysis (Taddlie and Tashakkori, 2003). The core argument for mixed method design is that the combination of both forms of data provide a better understanding of a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative data by itself (Creswell, 2012). The qualitative data were collected from open-ended questions, interviews as well as document analysis. Whereas, the quantitative data was collected through close-ended questionnaires. Thus, the researcher first collected the quantitative data and then qualitative data sequentially.

3.3. Sources of Data

The researcher used both primary and secondary data sources for this study. The primary data was collected from principals, teachers, dropout returnee students and Heads of Woreda education Offices for the reason that they can provide relevant information to understand the problem under study. The secondary data was gathered from students' Attendance, Roster and enrollment register of the sampled schools.

3.4 Population, Sampling Technique and Sample Size

3.4.1 Population

Arikunto (1998) states "Population is the whole of research subject". In other words, population is a group of individuals or items that share one or more characteristics from which data can be gathered and analyzed. Thus, secondary school teachers, dropout returnees, principals and Heads of woreda Education offices in Jimma Zone were considered as the study population. This area was decided to be taken as a setting for this study for two reasons. Firstly, since the researcher has worked in different schools located in different Woredas of the Zones, it was thought that this may better help him in the process of data collection. Secondly, since the Zone consisted of people with diversified

cultures, life styles and economic conditions, there is high probability that the findings could be at a certain level representative of the situation in other Zone too.

3.4.2 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

3.4.2.1 Sampling of Woredas

Currently, there are 21 Woredas in Jimma Zone. Out of 21 Woredas the researcher took three Woredas (14.3%) by using purposive sampling technique. In support to this, Gay and Arirasian (2003) state that the sample of 10% to 20% of the target population is often used in mixed research for large population. The researcher used purposive sampling technique because in these Woredas the problem of student dropout was relatively higher when compared with other woredas in the Zone. The table 1 below shows the enrolment and dropout of each Woredas in 2011 E.C.

/N	Woredas	Enrolment			Dropout			%
		M	F	T	M	F	T	
1	Agaro	1175	1489	2664	38	48	86	3.2
2	Chora Botor	870	957	1827	45	68	113	6.2
3	Dedo	598	621	1219	72	87	159	13
4	Gera	344	464	808	19	38	57	7
5	Goma	844	1135	1979	27	38	65	3.3
6	Gumay	401	371	772	12	18	30	3.9
7	L/Kossa	1725	1591	3316	125	131	256	7.7
8	L/Seka	417	441	858	30	37	67	7.8
9	Mana	810	935	1745	34	28	62	3.5
10	N/Benja	554	528	1082	76	51	112	10.3
11	O/Nada	867	1353	2220	115	119	234	10.5
12	Kersa	621	676	1297	32	66	98	7.6
13	S/Chokorsa	772	829	1601	23	28	51	3.2
14	Setama	202	218	420	16	16	32	7.6
15	Sh/Sombo	540	732	1272	36	59	95	7.5
16	Sigimo	220	421	641	8	9	17	2.7
17	Sokoru	892	715	1607	33	26	59	3.7
18	T/Afeta	436	312	748	16	38	54	7.2
19	Omo Beyam	418	323	741	19	11	30	4
20	Mencho	694	1042	1736	112	98	210	12
21	Botor Tolay	445	356	801	15	9	24	3
	Total	13,845	15,509	29,354	903	1023	1,926	6.5

Thus, the selected Woredas were Mancho Woreda, Dedo Woreda, and Omo Nada woreda.

3.4.2.3 Sampling of Schools

According to Jimma zone education office annual statistics abstract of 2018/19 there are 14 government secondary schools in the selected woredas. From these secondary schools, 7 secondary schools (50%) were selected by using lottery method. The researcher used lottery method because it gives equal chance of being selected to all schools in the study area. Thus, the selected secondary schools were Mole secondary school, Kusaye secondary school, Bilu secondary school, Dedo secondary school, Metoso secondary school, Boneya secondary school and Nada secondary school.

3.4.2.4 Sampling of Respondents

There were about 127 male and 27 female altogether 154 teachers in the selected secondary schools. Thus, 64 (50%) of male and 14(51.8%) of female respondents were selected by using simple random sampling. Concerning the school principals, all of them (7), one from each of the selected schools were included in the study to get adequate and relevant information, because they have different experience, qualification and exposure. As far as the woreda Education Office heads were concerned, the researcher included all of them into the study as they were 3 in number. With regard to returnees of dropout, the researcher selected 49 students from grade 9-10 by using snowball sampling method i.e 30 students from grade 9 and 19 students from grade 10.

Table 2.Sammary of the population and sample

Types of respondents	Target population	Sample	% of the sample	Sampling techniques
Teachers	154	78	50.6%	Simple random sampling
Returnee Students	49	49	100%	Snow ball sampling
Principals	7	7	100%	Purposive sampling
Woreda Education heads	7	7	100%	Purposive sampling
Total	217	141	65%	

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

In order to achieve the purpose of this study, the researcher used open-ended and close-ended self- made questionnaire, interview, and document analysis as data collection tools.

Questionnaire was used as data collection instrument to allow respondents express their ideas and opinions freely. Questionnaires containing three parts were prepared for the teachers and dropout returnees.

The first part was used to collect information about personal characteristics of the respondents while the second part was intended to secure information regarding the causes of students' dropouts from schools in the study area. The third part was intended to secure information regarding the consequences of student dropouts.

Additionally, interview was also used because of its convenience to get detail information from school leaders and Heads of Woreda education offices.

3.6 Pilot testing

The purpose of pilot study is to assess the clarity of the instrument items, the validity and reliability of each of the items in the questionnaire as well as the suitability of the language used in the instrument (Mulusa, 1988). Hence, thirty five students from the sampled schools were selected by systematic random sampling technique from grade 9 to 10 while thirty teachers were selected from the sampled schools for the same purpose (these were not included in the main study).

a) Validity

Mugenda (1999) define validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results. In other words validity is the degree to which results obtained from analysis of data actually represent the phenomenon under study. The first step towards validating the instruments of study was a pilot study. A total of seven schools were involved in the pilot study. Questionnaires were distributed to teachers and pupils of the selected schools by the researcher personally. During the exercise of collecting the questions back, the researcher discussed each item with the respondents in order to determine whether the items were correctly recorded and therefore, not open to misinterpretation when administered to the respondents during the main study. As a result of validity test, the researcher corrected 5 items and deleted 3 items from the questionnaire.

The second step towards determining the instrument validity is through submission of questionnaires and interview guides to the advisor. Any improvements suggested was used to make the instruments more valid.

b) Reliability

Reliability refers to the degree of consistency of a certain instrument when used repeatedly on the same subject. Cronbach (1984) stated that the alpha Cronbach method is a widely used statistical tool to study the reliability of a certain research questionnaire. The alpha value indicates degree of internal consistency. It is a function of the number of items in the scale and the degree of their inter correlations. Internal consistency is assessed using item-to-total correlation. Cronbach's α is the most commonly used test to determine the internal consistency of an instrument. Instruments with questions that have more than two responses can be used in this test (Shuttle, 2015). The Cronbach's α result is a number between 0 and 1. An acceptable reliability score is one that is 0.7 and higher (George & Mallery, 2003; Shuttle, 2015). After the pilot questionnaires were filled and returned. Then the reliability of the items were measured by using Crobanch's alpha method by the help of SPSS version 20. The obtained test result was 0.818. Then, as the result indicated it was a good indicator of the internal consistency of the items.

Table 3: Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha

No	Variables	No. of items	Cronbach Alpha
1	Pupils related factors	6	0.74
2	Teachers Related Factors	4	0.81
3	School Related Factors	6	0.83
4	Administrative Factors	4	0.76
5	Economical Related Factors	5	0.946
6	Social Factors	4	0.971
7	Cultural Factors	3	0.865
8	Economic problems	4	0.733
9	Social problems	5	0.875
	Average Reliability result	41	0.818

Cronbach's alpha coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb: ≥ 0.9 – Excellent, ≥ 0.8 – Good, ≥ 0.7 – Acceptable, ≥ 0.6 – Questionable, ≥ 0.5 – Poor and ≤ 0.5 – Unacceptable. It is noted that an alpha of (0.818) is good to use the question for the research.

3.7 Variables of the study

According to Creswell (2012), a variable is a characteristic or attribute of an individual or an organization that researcher can measure or observe and varies among individuals or organization studied. They are key ideas that researcher seek to collect information on to address the purpose of their study.

We can divide variables in to two: independent and dependent variable. An independent variable is an attribute or characteristic that influences an outcome or dependent variable whereas a dependent variable is an attribute or characteristic that is dependent or influenced by the independent variable (Creswell, 2012). Therefore, in this study the variables are identified as follows:

3.7.1 Independent variable

3.7.1.1 Student and home related cause

Financial cause is one of the independent variables associated with student dropout. A number of studies state the relationship between the rates of drop-out and financial problems, such as, poverty, low income, or irregular/seasonal pattern of income as a major cause of drop-out. The other independent variable associated with student dropout is parental attitude. In a survey in rural Malawi, 38.6% of fathers and 27.0% of mothers responded that negative and uninterested attitude of parents towards educating girls is the most significant cause of dropping out (Davison and Kanyuka 1993). Moreover, work and household chores can also be causes of drop-out. In a household with low income, childrens' earnings are also necessary and this hinders school attendance. Gender is also one of the significant factors in drop-out. Pregnancy and early marriage are gender-related dominant causes of drop-out from second level education and the later stage of primary education. Furthermore, over-age can also be an independent variable which can influence student dropout. A number of studies state that over-aged pupils/students are more likely to drop out than those who enrolled in appropriate age. Over-aged pupils tend to have difficulties in adjustment. Learning difficulty is also the other independent variable. A number of studies state students' low academic achievement (Singh 1989, Kirui 1982) as causes of dropping out. Abilities in reading (Kortering et al 1992) and mathematics (Singh 1989), as well as learning style (Svec 1990), are said to be associated with dropout. Similarly, Ethnicity/cultural minority is also the other independent variable influencing dropout. Student drop-out in multi-racial/cultural societies has a strong relationship with ethnicity. Svec (1990) observed that the high rate of drop-out was associated with ethnicity and poverty much more than academic performance, suggesting that the link between the high drop-out rate and ethnic affiliation should be treated carefully.

3.7.1.2 School and school system related causes

Under school and school system related causes the Variables such as teachers, educational facilities, curriculum/education system, school/community gap, lack of employment, distance from school and school related expenses are identified as independent variables.

3.7.2 Dependent variables

According to Creswell (2012), dependent variable is an attribute or characteristic that is dependent or influenced by the independent variable. Thus, in this study, attributes such as dropout, wastage, low retention and low completion were identified as dependent variables.

3.8 Procedures of Data Collection

After the first drafts of both tools (questionnaires and interview) were prepared they were commented on by academic advisor. Based on the comment and suggestion on the format and items, necessary modification of items and formatting was made. Then, they was submitted to the advisor. Including important comments of academic advisor, the final draft of the tool was developed. After all considerations and modifications were made, the instruments were ready for main study. In the main study, questionnaires were distributed for all dropout returnees and 91 teachers from the sampled schools. All questionnaires distributed for students and teachers were fully returned back. The questionnaires that were prepared for the dropout returnees were constructed into three parts. The first part was used to collect information about students' background information. The second part was intended to secure information regarding determinants of student dropout from schools in the study area. In particular, part two of each item is constructed in five point scale alternative responses ranging from 5= very high, 4= high, 3=Medium, 2=low, to 1=very low. The mean score for each item was calculated using the median line (i.e. 3.0) as a dividing line; those items whose mean become below 3 were assumed having less significant contribution to the problem. This helped the researcher to gather relevant information about major out-of-school and in-school factors that contribute to student dropout. The third part was intended to secure information regarding the consequences of student dropouts.

The questionnaires prepared for teachers were also designed in a similar approach and context like that of students'. Before developing the two sets of questionnaires, the relevant and related literatures from different sources were thoroughly examined. The pilot study of the tools was carried out in the similar setting to the study place. In general, before the administration of the tools the participants were briefly told the objective and purpose of the study. Finally, after taking the necessary correction and preparation, the questionnaires

were distributed to the respondents on the appropriate schedule time. Regarding the interview, it was conducted with the school principals and Heads of Woreda Education Offices in the study area. It was intended to elicit information about the reasons that would be ascribed to pupil's dropout from secondary schools and its consequences. They were preferred because the researcher believed that they had better understanding about the problem under study.

3.9 Method of data Analysis

Depending on the nature of the problem and the data collected, different statistical tools were employed in the study for data analysis and interpretation. The data collected through questionnaires were analyzed and interpreted by using frequency, percentage, mean, weight mean, independent sample t-test and multiple regression analysis. Percentage and frequency were used to present personal background information while mean and weight mean were employed to analyze the causes of student dropout in the study area. For more advanced statistical operations, data were inserted into statistical software programme SPSS version 20 and further analysis was done. Thus, independent sample t-test was used to see whether there is significant difference between means of the two groups of respondents (teachers and students). Similarly, multiple regression analysis was used to find out the influence each factor on students' dropout. The data obtained through interview was narrated to substantiate the teachers and dropout returnee's responses. Finally, conclusion and recommendation were drawn based on the findings.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues was highly considered in this study. Prior to data collection, permission letter was sought from Jimma University College of Education and Behavioral sciences. Permission was sought from Jimma Zone Education Office and the Woreda Education Offices to use the schools for the study. At school level, the School principals were asked to give consent for the pupils and teachers to participate in the study. At the end consent of the participants were also sought and the aim of the study was clearly explained to the participants before commencement of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. It deals with the analysis of the data collected through questionnaires, interviews and documentary analysis of the sample schools. The responses obtained through interviews and documentary analysis were used to add ideas to the teachers' and students' responses.

4.1. Characteristic of Respondents

As stated earlier, the subjects of this study were teachers, principals, dropout returnee students and heads of woreda education offices of the sample Woredas. In this section the back ground information of the respondents (returnee students & teachers) is presented.

Table 4. Returnee students' background information

S. N o.	Name of Schools	Grade						Gender						Age					
		9		10		Tt		M		F		Tt		≤16		>16		Tt	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Nada Sec. Schools	5	55.5	4	44.4	9	100	4	44.4	5	55.5	9	100	3	33.3	6	66.6	9	100
2	Dedo Sec. Schools	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100	3	37.5	5	62.5	8	100	3	37.5	5	62.5	8	100
3	Mole Sec. Schools	4	57.1	3	42.8	7	100	3	42.8	4	57.1	7	100	2	28.5	5	71.4	7	100
4	Boneya Sec. Schools	4	66.6	2	33.3	6	100	3	50	3	50	6	100	2	33.3	4	66.6	6	100
5	Metoso Sec. Schools	4	57.1	3	42.8	7	100	3	42.8	4	57.1	7	100	2	28.5	5	71.4	7	100
6	Bilu Sec. Schools	4	66.6	2	33.3	6	100	2	33.3	4	66.6	6	100	2	33.3	4	66.6	6	100
7	kusaye Sec. Schools	4	66.6	2	33.3	6	100	3	50	3	50	6	100	1	16.6	5	83.3	6	100
	Tt	30	61.2	19	38.7	49	100	21	42.8	28	57.2	49	100	15	30.6	34	69.3	49	100

Source: Adopted from Jimma Zone Education Office Annual Report

Table 4 shows, the numbers of female students were higher than that of males. Out of the total of dropout returnees, i.e. 49, 28(57.2 %) were females and 21 (42.8%) were males. This figure indicates that females were more likely to come back to school than males after dropout. With regard to their age, 15 (30.6 percent) and 34 (69.3percent) of them were in the age of 16 or below 16 and above16 years respectively. From this, it can be concluded that majority (69.3 percent) of dropout returnee students were over aged. Thus, the findings are more reflective of females and students aged above 16 years old.

Similarly, one interviewee expressed his view as follows:

Girls are more likely forced to be married before completing secondary school, especially in rural areas, parents with low education back ground force their female students to be married early before completing secondary school. Respondents further explained that the pressure to leave school tends to increase as children grow older and their opportunity cost rise.

4.1.1 Background of Teacher

Table 5: Characteristics of the Teachers by their Sex, Age and Educational Status

No	Item	Responses	
		F	%
1	Gender		
	• Male	64	82
	• Female	14	18
2	Age Interval		
	• 20-25 years	14	18
	• 26-30 years	16	20.5
	• 31-35 years	22	28.2
	• 36-40 years	21	26.9
	• 41 and above	5	6.4
3	Educational Status		
	• Certificate	0	0
	• Diploma	11	14.1
	• First Degree	64	82
	• Second Degree	3	3.8
	Total	78	100
4	Experience		
	Below 3 years	7	9
	3-5 years	14	17.9
	6-10 years	23	29.5
	11-15 years	28	35.9
	Above 16 years	6	7.7
	Total	78	100

As it can be seen in table 4, 78(50.6%) of teachers participated in the study and from this 64(82 %) were males and 14(18 %) were females. This shows that female teachers in Secondary schools of the study area were rare compared to male teachers. With regard to their ages, 14(18 %) and 16(20.5) of them were between the age interval of 20-25 years and 26-30 years respectively while 22(28.2 %), 21(26.9 %) and 5(6.4 %) of them were between the age interval of 31-35 years, 36-40 years and 41 and above years respectively. This indicates that most of respondents' age was in t h e adulthood especially from 31-35 years.

With respect to teachers' educational level the great majority that is 64(82 %) of them indicated that they were first degree graduates, while 3(3.8 %) of teacher respondents said that their educational status is second degree. In addition, 11(14.1 %) of them were diploma which is below the standard set for secondary schools.   This indicates that there are still teachers who do not fit the standard of secondary schools teaching in the study area. This may have its own impact on efficiency of educational system.

Regarding teachers experience 7(9 %) and 14 (17.9 %) of them have served below three years and 3-5 years respectively. The remaining 23(29.5 %), 28(35.9 %), and 6(7.7 %) of them served 6-10 years, 11-15 years and above 16 years respectively. This implies that teachers who had different teaching experiences were participated as the respondents. had more enthusiasm than older ones.

4.2. The status of student dropout in the study area

Table 6: The status of student dropout rate in the study area (2007-2010 E.C)

Academic Year	Total enrolment	Total dropout in numbers	Dropout rate in (%)
2007	23,384	959	4.1
2008	26,763	1017	3.8
2009	30,572	1039	3.4
2010	31,132	903	2.9

Source: adopted from roster of pupils in secondary schools of sample woredas

From this evidence, in the study area, dropout rates for 2007-2010 academic years were 4.1, 3.8, 3.4 and 2.9 % respectively. Table 6 also shows dropout rate in absolute number and its rate of change from each previous year. As it can be seen from the table 6, of the total number of pupils enrolled in secondary schools of the sampled weredas in 2007 academic year 4.1 % of them left schools. In the next academic year (2008), the rate of dropout was decreased to 3.8 %. Similarly for 2009 and 2010 academic years, the rate of dropout declined to 3.4 and 2.9 % respectively.

Further more, when students' dropout trend in the study area was examined in absolute number, the total number of students' dropout in 2007 was 959 but it was 1017, 1039 and 903 in the next three consecutive academic years (2008-2010). From this, it can be concluded that the trends of students' dropout rate in secondary schools of the study area show a decreasing tendency from year to year.

The qualitative data obtained from interview participant is in line with the above findings. Participants in the discussion expressed their views about early departure of students in the secondary schools in the following ways.

Some students experienced problems with their transition to secondary school. This is due to the deterioration of school performance during their primary school achievement. Students were become desperate when they transferred to secondary school due to their poor background in their primary school attainment. This negative experience decreased students' commitment to

school and contributed to their early school leaving. However, improvement has been seen   in the dropout rate of Secondary school students recently.

The interview participants further explained the reason for the improvement of dropout rates in the study area were found to be related to the creation of job /employment opportunities for students who completed grade 10.

4.2.1. Dropout Rates by Grade level and Gender

Table 3 presents the rates of pupils' dropout in terms of percentage of enrollment for 2007-2010 academic year. The data reveals that dropout rates of secondary schools in the study area were higher in grade 9 when compared with the grade 10.

Table 7: Dropout Rates in (%) by Grade Level and Gender in secondary Schools (9-10) of the Study area

Grade Level	Academic year											
	2007			2008			2009			2010		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
9	3.9	6.1	5.0	4.0	5.2	4.5	3.6	5.5	4.9	2.8	3.4	3.1
10	3.7	4.8	4.2	3.8	4.8	4.4	3.4	4.2	3.8	2.4	2.5	2.5

Source: Adopted from roster of the pupils in secondary schools of sample woredas

From the data in table 7, we can understand that the observed differences were seen from grade 9 to 10 for all academic years. Accordingly the rates of dropouts were higher in Grade 9 in the study area. Moreover, as we can see from the table above more female than male dropout was observed, though the difference seems small the rates of dropout in secondary school of the study area were higher among girls than boys in 2007-2010 academic year in both grades.

4.3. The Key determinants of Students Dropout from School

One of the major objectives of this study was to investigate the key determinants that contribute to students' dropout. Thus, attempt was made to identify some in-school and out-school factors that may have contribution to pupils' dropout in the area.

Accordingly, 20 in-school related factors and 12 out of school related factors have been

identified and then teachers and dropout returnee students were asked to indicate the extent of the contribution of each factor to the problem.

In computing the value of their responses, the researcher has used different points that represent the extent of the influence of each factor which include 1-1.80 as very low, 1.81-2.60 as low, 2.61-3.40 as moderate, 3.41-4.20 as high and 4.21-5.00 as very high.

4.3.1. In School Factors

Table 8:- Pupils related factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Health problems	Students	49	1.70	0.46	1.74	0.83	0.41
		Teachers	78	1.77	0.43			
2	Disability	Students	49	2.52	0.86	2.44	1.02	0.30
		Teachers	78	2.35	0.94			
3	Over-age	Students	49	3.25	0.87	3.26	1.04	0.97
		Teachers	78	3.28	0.91			
4	Involvement in domestic work / household chores	Students	49	3.52	0.88	3.59	0.93	0.36
		Teachers	78	3.66	0.82			
5	Frequent repetition	Students	49	2.53	0.84	2.45	0.87	0.38
		Teachers	78	2.37	0.93			
6	Regular absenteeism	Students	49	3.64	1.12	3.68	0.42	0.67
		Teachers	78	3.73	1.14			
	Average .mean	Students	49	2.87		2.86		
		Teachers	78	2.86				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

As we can see from the table above regular absenteeism from school (WM=3.68, t=0.42, P<0.05) and students involvement in domestic work (WM=3.59, t=0.93, P<0.05) were significant pupils related factors of students' dropout in the study area.

Table 8 presents the students' and teachers' responses on the extent of the impact of pupils related factors on students' dropout. With respect to item number 1 which is concerned with the health problem it was rated as very low as indicated in the mean values of 1.70 and 1.77 by students and teachers respectively with 1.74 weighted mean values. The t-value (0.83) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.41) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the contribution of health problem on students' dropout in the study area is very low.

Disability on item number 2 of the table 8, was rated at low level as indicated in the mean values of 2.52 and 2.35 by students and teachers respectively with 2.44 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.02) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.30) greater than significant level (0.05) which indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Regarding item number 3 on the table 8, which is concerned with over-age as a cause of student's dropout it was rated as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.25 and 3.28 by students and teachers respectively with 3.26 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.04) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.97) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Concerning the involvement of students in domestic work or household chores, it was rated as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.52 and 3.66 by students and teachers respectively with 3.59 weighted mean values. The t-value (0.93) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.36) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the involvement of students in domestic work or household chores is significant pupil related factor of students' dropout in the study area.

Consistently the information from Principals showed that many students abandon school and go to work as domestic servants because their parents cannot afford to pay for their school expenses. The respondents further explained that on average about 15-20 students absent from school daily mainly because of household chores and income generating activities.

Regarding to frequent repetition it was rated as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.53 and 2.37 by students and teachers respectively with 2.45 weighted mean values. The t-value (0.87) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.38) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

With respect to item number 6 on the table 8, which is concerned with the regular absenteeism, it was rated as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.64 and 3.73 by students and teachers respectively with 3.68 weighted mean values. The t-value (0.42) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.67) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that regular absenteeism is one of the significant pupil related factor in the study area.

This is in line with the qualitative data gained from the interview participants. According to the respondents some students have less interest towards education, as a result, they regularly absent from school. They go to school with the pressure of external forces. For instance completing a certain grade is compulsory to obtain driving license. Engaging in commercial activities or becoming a driver has better income than being employed in government offices. On the other hand, private occupations do not demand completing secondary schools at this time. That is why students drop out from this level not to disburse opportunity costs secondary education has.

Generally, pupils related factors were rated as moderate as indicated in the average mean of 2.87 and 2.86 by students and teachers respectively with 2.86 weighted mean values.

Table 9:- Teachers Related Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Less qualified teachers	Students	49	2.52	0.86	2.44	1.11	0.43
		Teachers	78	2.35	0.94			
2	Lack of encouragement given by teacher to pupils	Students	49	3.28	0.88	3.28	1.05	0.87
		Teachers	78	3.28	0.92			
3	Lack of support to students who have academic Difficulties	Students	49	2.90	1.35	2.87	1.23	0.85
		Teachers	78	2.84	1.28			
4	Inappropriate evaluation of pupils Performance	Students	49	2.94	1.36	2.91	1.25	0.81
		Teachers	78	2.87	1.29			
	Average .mean	Students	49	2.91		2.87		
		Teachers	78	2.84				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 9 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of teachers related factors on students' dropouts. With regard to item 1 which is concerned with less qualified teachers it was rated as low level as indicated in the mean values of 2.52 and 2.35 by students and teachers respectively with 2.44 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.11) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.43) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this one can conclude that the impact of less qualified teacher on students' dropout is low in the study area.

With respect to item 2 on the table 9, which is concerned with lack of encouragement given by teacher to pupils it was rated as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.28 and 3.28 by students and teachers respectively with 3.28 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.05) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.87) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Similarly, lack of support to students who have academic difficulties was rated as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.90 and 2.84 by students and teachers respectively with 2.87 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.23) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.85) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

This finding is in agreement with the view of interview participants. According to them unless low achieving students obtained additional support, their frustration increases. They may like to cease their schooling not to repeat the same grade level. Besides, students are suspended for minor infractions in schools. For instance absence of tutorial class for students with academic difficulties and less attractive instructional strategies used by teachers without regard to individual student learning styles may lead students to quit from schools. More over inappropriate evaluation of pupil's performance was rated as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.94 and 2.87 by students and teachers respectively with 2.91 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.25) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.81) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. Generally, teachers related factors was rated as moderate as indicated in the average means of 2.91 and 2.84 by students and teachers respectively with 2.87 weighted mean values.

Table 10: School Related Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	School distance from the home	Students	49	3.57	1.19	3.49	1.66	0.50
		Teachers	78	3.42	1.25			
2	School related expense	Students	49	2.55	0.84	2.34	1.31	0.19
		Teachers	78	2.33	0.95			
3	Lack of employment	Students	49	3.22	1.05	3.27	1.49	0.61
		Teachers	78	3.32	1.06			
4	Inadequacy of educational materials	Students	49	2.98	1.29	2.93	1.45	0.64
		Teachers	78	2.87	1.28			
5	Irrelevance of the curriculum to the community	Students	49	2.45	0.91	2.55	1.84	0.28
		Teachers	78	2.64	1.07			
6	Absence community participation	Students	49	2.89	1.16	2.94	1.40	0.68
		Teachers	78	2.99	1.22			
	Average mean	Students	49	2.92		2.93		
		Teachers	78	2.95				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 10 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of school related factors on students' dropouts. With regard to item number 1 which is concerned with school distance from students' home, the respondents rated it as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.57 and 3.42 by students and teachers respectively with 3.49 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.66) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.50) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that school distance from students' home is one of the major causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Similarly information from the interviewed respondents showed that long distance daily commuting to School also made students especially female students to lose hope and abandoned schooling.

With respect to school related expense the respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.55 and 2.33 by students and teachers respectively with 2.34 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.31) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.19) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this one can conclude that school related expense is not the major cause of students' dropout in the study area.

Regarding lack of employment the respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.22 and 3.32 by students and teachers respectively with 3.27 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.49) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.61) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that school distance from students' home has moderate impact on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

As to inadequacy of educational materials, both group of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.98 and 2.87 by students and teachers respectively with 2.93 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.45) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.64) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This indicates that inadequacy of educational materials have moderate impact on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

With respect to the irrelevance of the curriculum to the community on item number 5, the respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.45 and 2.64 by students and teachers respectively with 2.55 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.84) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.28) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this we can conclude that irrelevance of the curriculum to the community has low impact on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Concerning absence community participation on item number 6, both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.89 and 2.99 by students and teachers respectively with 2.94 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.40) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.68) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that absence community participation has moderate impact on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

In general, the influence of school related factors on the causes of students' dropout in the study area was moderate as indicated in the average mean of 2.92 and 2.95 by students and teachers respectively with 2.93 weighted mean values.

This is in line with the qualitative data gained from the interview participants. The researcher asked the interview participants to mention some of the major causes of student dropouts in the study area.

According to them regular absenteeism, school distance from home, lack of employment, and involvement in domestic work/ house hold chores are some of the major in school factors that cause student dropout in the study area. Besides, the use of English language as a medium of instruction, exam-oriented education systems, geographical challenges, in particular, the inconvenient transportation services and poor road conditions played an important role in student dropout in secondary school especially in rural areas as respondents explained.

Table 11: Administrative Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Poor school management	Students	49	3.25	1.04	3.32	1.70	0.48
		Teachers	78	3.38	1.10			
2	Inappropriate school rules	Students	49	2.73	1.06	2.79	1.12	0.92
		Teachers	78	2.85	1.00			
3	Disciplinary problem of students	Students	49	2.02	0.520	2.02	1.07	0.94
		Teachers	78	2.01	0.63			
4	Passive instructional technique	Students	49	2.71	1.19	2.74	1.19	0.84
		Teachers	78	2.76	1.19			
	Average mean	Students	49	2.68		2.72		
		Teachers	78	2.75				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table11 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of administrative factors on students' dropouts. With respect to item number 1 which is concerned with poor school management both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.25 and 3.38 by students and teachers respectively with 3.32 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.70) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.48) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that poor school management has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

With respect to inappropriate school rules on item number 2, both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.73 and 2.85 by students and teachers respectively with 2.79 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.12) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.92) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This indicates that the influence of inappropriate school rules on the causes of students' dropout in the study area was moderate.

Regarding the disciplinary problem of student both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.02 and 2.01 by students and teachers respectively with 2.02 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.07) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.94) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the influence of disciplinary problem on the causes of students' dropout in the study area was low. Thus, one can conclude that disciplinary problem is not the major cause of students' dropout in the study area.

Concerning passive instructional technique on item number 4 both group of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.71 and 2.76 by students and teachers respectively with 2.74 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.19) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.84) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that passive instructional technique has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Generally, the influence of administrative factors on the causes of students' dropout in the study area was moderate as indicated in the average mean of 2.68 and 2.75 by students and teachers respectively with 2.72 weighted mean values.

4.3.2:- Out- of School Factors

Table 12:- Economic Related Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	poverty/Inability to pay school expenses	Students	49	3.51	0.89	3.58	1.01	0.61
		Teachers	78	3.66	0.82			
2	Parent's need of pupils' labor	Students	49	2.95	1.19	2.91	1.39	0.69
		Teachers	78	2.87	1.24			
3	Pupils involvement in income generating activities	Students	49	3.12	1.25	3.13	1.08	0.53
		Teachers	78	3.14	1.15			
4	Parents lack of perceived benefit from education	Students	49	3.51	0.89	3.58	1.01	0.61
		Teachers	78	3.66	0.82			
5	Drought and/or famine	Students	49	2.37	1.21	2.51	1.18	0.24
		Teachers	78	2.64	1.28			
	Average mean	Students	49	3.09		3.14		
		Teachers	78	3.19				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81- 2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 12 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of economical related factors on student dropouts. With respect to item number1 which is concerned with poverty/inability to pay school expenses both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.51 and 3.66 by students and teachers respectively with 3.58 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.01) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.61) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that poverty/inability to pay school expenses has high impact on the causes of students' dropout in the study area. Thus, we can conclude that poverty is significantly contributing to students' dropout in the study area.

In line with the above finding National Center for Educational Statistics (2002) study conducted in the United States found that students from a lower socioeconomic status were more likely to drop out of school than a student from a higher socioeconomic status. This study further affirmed that students from low-income families have a dropout rate of 10 percent than students from high-income families.

With regard to parents need for pupils' labor both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.95 and 2.87 by students and teachers respectively with 2.91 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.39) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.69) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that parents need for pupils' labor has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Consistently, the views of interview respondents were in line with the above finding. According to them parent's need of pupils' labor is among the major out of school factors for students drop out. Since majority of the zone populations have engaged in agriculture, parents need their pupils' labor during harvesting and other farming activities. This may lead students missed many school days and finally depart from school.

As to pupil's involvement in income generating activities both groups of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.12 and 3.14 by students and teachers respectively with 3.13 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.08) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.53) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference

between the two groups of respondents. This indicates that pupil's involvement in income generating activities has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Concerning parent's lack of perceived benefit from education both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.51and 3.66 by students and teachers respectively with 3.58 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.01) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.61) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this one can conclude that parents lack of perceived benefit from education has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

With respect to drought and/or famine both students' and teachers' respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.37 and 2.64 by students and teachers respectively with 2.51 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.18) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.24) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that drought and/or famine has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

Generally, economic factors were significant out of school factors of students drop out in the study area as indicated in the average mean of 3.09 and 3.19 by students and teachers respectively with 3.14 weighted mean values.

These findings are in agreement with the ideas of the interview participants. For them poverty, parent's need of pupils' labor for work , pupils' involvement in income generating activities, parents lack of perceived benefits from education, parental attitude and Peer group influence were the major out of school factors causing student dropout.

Besides, unconducive home environment and the use of English language as a medium of instruction hindered students' academic progress which, in turn, led to low academic achievements and ultimately student dropout as the respondents explained. Respondents were also asked to explain another out of school factor causing student dropout and state that migration to Arab countries as another major causes of student dropout in the study area.

Table 13:- Social Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Parental attitude	Students	49	3.12	1.25	3.13	1.08	0.53
		Teachers	78	3.14	1.15			
2	Parental death	Students	49	1.69	0.46	1.73	1.94	0.35
		Teachers	78	1.76	0.42			
3	Family breakdown	Students	49	2.55	0.84	2.4	1.31	0.19
		Teachers	78	2.33	0.94			
4	Peer group influence	Students	49	3.51	0.89	3.58	1.01	0.61
		Teachers	78	3.66	0.82			
	Average mean	Students	49	2.72		2.72		
		Teachers	78	2.73				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 13 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of social factors on student dropouts. With regard to item number 1 which is concerned with parental attitude both student and teacher respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.12 and 3.14 by students and teachers respectively with 3.13 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.08) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.53) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that parental attitude has moderate influence on the causes of students' dropout in the study area.

With respect to item number 2 on the table 13, which is concerned with parental death both student and teacher respondents rated it as very low as indicated in the mean values of 1.69 and 1.76 by students and teachers respectively with 1.73 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.94) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.35) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this one can conclude that the effect of parental death on the causes of students' dropout was not significant in the study area.

Concerning family breakdown both group of respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.55 and 2.33 by students and teachers respectively with 2.4 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.31) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.19) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the effect of family breakdown on the causes of students' dropout was not significant in the study area.

Regarding peer group influence both student and teacher respondents rated it as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.51 and 3.66 by students and teachers respectively with 3.58 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.01) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.61) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the influence of peer group on the causes of students' dropout was high in the study area.

Generally, social factors were significant out of school factors of students drop out in the study area as indicated in the average mean of 3.09 and 3.19 by students and teachers respectively with 3.14 weighted mean values.

Table 14:- Cultural Factors that Cause Student Dropouts

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Early marriage	Students	49	2.85	0.84	2.89	1.39	0.46
		Teachers	78	2.93	0.94			
2	Pregnancy	Students	49	3.63	1.13	3.68	1.88	0.65
		Teachers	78	3.73	1.14			
3	Ethnic minority	Students	49	1.76	0.46	1.76	0.99	0.77
		Teachers	78	1.77	0.42			
	Average mean	Students	49	2.72		2.77		
		Teachers	78	2.81				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 14 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the contribution of cultural factors on student dropouts. With regard to item number 1 which is concerned with early marriage both student and teacher respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.85 and 2.93 by students and teachers respectively with 2.89 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.39) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.46) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. From this one can conclude that the influence of early marriage on the causes of students' dropout was moderate in the study area.

With respect to Pregnancy both student and teacher respondents rated it as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.63 and 3.73 by students and teachers respectively with 3.68 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.88) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.65) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the influence of Pregnancy on the causes of students' dropout was high in the study area.

Regarding ethnic minority both student and teacher respondents rated it as very low as indicated in the mean values of 1.76 and 1.77 by students and teachers respectively with 1.76 weighted mean values. The t-value (0.99) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.77) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This implies that the influence of ethnic minority on the causes of students' dropout was very low in the study area.

In general, cultural factors were significant out of school factors of students drop out in the study area as indicated in the average mean of 2.72 and 2.81 by students and teachers respectively with 2.77 weighted mean values.

3.3. Multiple regression analysis for student's dropout factors

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the independent effects of each factor of student dropouts.

Table 15: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	. 592	.350	.34	.454	21.61	.000

a. Predictors (Constant): Pupils related factors, teachers related factors, school related factors, administrative factors, economic related factors, social factors and cultural factors.

The R square is an important measure which indicates how much of the variance in the dependent variable is accounted for by the different predictors in the model.

The adjusted R square indicates how well the model can be generalized in the population (Fields, 2009). The R square in the data analysis is 0.350, which means that 35% of the variance in student's dropouts is explained by the combination of independent variables.

The F ratio measures whether the model as a whole has statistically significant predictive capacity. The standardized beta value indicates which independent variable account for the strongest, unique contribution to explain the dependent variable, when the variance explained by the other independent variables in the model is controlled (Pallant, 2005). This was assessed by checking whether the p values are smaller than the significance criterion 0.05

Table 16: Multiple Regression analysis for Student Dropouts factors

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.921	.121		7.582	.000
	Pupils related factors	.308	.072	.804	4.256	.000
	Teachers Related Factors	.306	.051	.684	5.988	.000
	School Related Factors	.116	.031	.212	3.747	.000
	Administrative Factors	.213	.060	.486	3.560	.000
	Economical Related Factors	.205	.086	.366	4.78	.000
	Social Factors	.126	.066	.209	8.747	.000
	Cultural Factors	.413	.070	.586	5.560	.000

a. Dependent Variable: student's dropouts

P<0.05

Using the enter method it was found that the seven factors of student dropout variable had an overall positive impact on explaining the variance in student dropouts factors (F=21.61, R^2 =0.35, ΔR^2 = 0.34, P< 0.05). The result shows that 35% of the variation in student dropout factors can be explained. When adjusted R^2 (ΔR^2) is used the model predicts about 34% variation in student dropouts factors.

The results of table 16 shows that aggregate pupils related factors (B=0.308, β=0.804, P<0.05) , aggregate teachers related factors (B=0.306, β=0.684, P<0.05) , aggregate cultural factors (B=0.413, β=0.586, P<0.05) and aggregate administrative factors ((B=0.213, β=0.486, P<0.05) had significant and moderately strong positive impacts on student dropouts. On the other hands, aggregate economical related factors (B=0.205, β=0.366, P<0.05), aggregate school related factors, aggregate administrative factors (B=0.116, β=0.212, P < 0.05) and aggregate social factors (B=0.126, β=0.209, P < 0.05) had a significant and moderately positive impacts on student dropouts.

4.4. Consequences of students' dropout

Table 17:- Economic problems

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Low productivity	Students	49	2.97	1.29	2.92	1.46	0.65
		Teachers	78	2.87	1.28			
2	Dependency	Students	49	3.57	1.19	3.49	1.67	0.51
		Teachers	78	3.42	1.25			
3	Low employment Opportunities	Students	49	3.00	1.16	3.00	1.41	0.68
		Teachers	78	2.99	1.22			
4	Inability to use new technologies	Students	49	3.25	1.04	3.32	1.70	0.48
		Teachers	78	3.39	1.10			
	Average mean	Students	49	3.19		3.17		
		Teachers	78	3.16				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =0.05, t-critical value =1.99, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 18 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the economic problems as consequence of student's dropouts. With respect to item number1 which is concerned with low productivity both teacher and student respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.97 and 2.87 by students and teachers respectively with 2.92 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.46) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.65) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Concerning dependency as consequence of student's dropout both teacher and student respondents rated it as high as indicated in the mean values of 3.57 and 3.42 by students and teachers respectively with 3.49 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.67) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.51) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

As to unemployment as consequence of student's dropout both teacher and student respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.00 and 2.99 by students and teachers respectively with 3.00 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.41) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.68) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Regarding poverty as consequence of student's dropout both teacher and student respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.25 and 3.39 by students and teachers respectively with 3.32 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.70) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.48) greater than significant level (0.05) which is denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Generally, economic problem as consequence of student's dropout was rated at moderate level as indicated in the average means of 3.19 and 3.16 by students and teachers respectively with 3.17 weighted mean values.

Table 18:- Social problems

No	Item	Respondents	N	Mean	SD	WM	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
1	Stealing	Students	49	2.86	0.96	2.88	1.12	0.90
		Teachers	78	2.90	1.00			
2	Damaging properties	Students	49	3.10	0.96	3.08	1.15	0.88
		Teachers	78	3.07	0.92			
3	Fighting/swearing	Students	49	3.00	1.04	3.18	2.06	0.04
		Teachers	78	3.37	0.95			
4	Drug abuse	Students	49	2.71	1.19	2.73	1.19	0.85
		Teachers	78	2.75	1.19			
5	Crime	Students	49	2.57	1.14	2.56	1.03	0.97
		Teachers	78	2.56	1.07			
	average .mean	Students	49	2.85		2.89		
		Teachers	78	2.93				

WM = Weighted mean, Significant level =*0.05*, t-critical value =*1.99*, Sig (2 tailed) =P, Mean scores 1- 1.80 = very low, 1.81-2.60= low, 2.61-3.40 = moderate, 3.41-4.20 = high and 4.21- 5.00 = very high

Table 18 presents the teachers' and the students' responses on the extent of the social problems as consequence of student's dropout. With regard to item number 1 which is concerned with stealing both group of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.86 and 2.90 by students and teachers respectively with 2.88 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.12) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.90) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

With respect to damaging properties both group of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.10 and 3.07 by students and teachers respectively with 3.08 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.15) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.88) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Regarding fighting/swearing as consequence of student's dropouts both teacher and student respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 3.00 and 3.37 by students and teachers respectively with 3.18 weighted mean values. The t-value (2.06) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.04) less than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Pertaining to drug abuse both group of respondents rated it as moderate as indicated in the mean values of 2.71 and 2.75 by students and teachers respectively with 2.73 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.19) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.85) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Concerning crime as consequence of student's dropouts both teacher and student respondents rated it as low as indicated in the mean values of 2.57 and 2.56 by students and teachers respectively with 2.56 weighted mean values. The t-value (1.03) is less than t-critical value (1.99) and p value (0.97) greater than significant level (0.05) which denotes that there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Generally, social problems as consequents of student's dropouts was rated at moderate level as indicated in the average means of 2.85 and 2.93 by students and teachers respectively with 2.89 weighted mean values.

In line with this the idea of the interview participants revealed consistent result. According to them at least three harmful effects result when students dropped out of school. First, they face an increased probability of reduced economic and employment-related prospects. This increase usually translates into a bleak future of minimum wages and part-the jobs or unemployment. Second, students who leave school can create enormous social and economic costs for society. Social problems related to school attrition may include higher rates of delinquency, criminal activity, drug abuse, incarceration, and other .The economic costs of the dropout problem may include reliance on social welfare. Other economic costs of the dropout problem may be incurred by lost earnings or unrealized taxes. Third, respondents added that failure to complete high school may severely limit an individual's chances of success during adulthood. Students who leave school before completing high school often suffer both financially and emotionally because of reduced employment prospects, delinquency, drug abuse, low self-esteem, and low achievement.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Summary of the Major Findings

This study was concerned with the causes and consequences of students' dropout in government secondary schools of Jimma zone. The main purpose of the study was to investigate the magnitude of the problem (drop out,) to probe the major factors that cause students dropout from schools and to assess the consequences of student dropouts.

The study was carried out in seven government secondary schools. The participants of the study were 78 teachers, 49 dropout returnee students, 7 principals and 3 Heads of woreda Education Offices.

Data were obtained through questionnaires from the teachers and dropout returnee students and interview with principals and Heads of woreda Education Offices. Moreover relevant documents accessed from Jimma Zone Education Offices and the sample schools.

The data obtained were analyzed using statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, independent sample t-test and multiple regression analysis. Based on the analysis the following major findings were obtained.

In the study area the numbers of female returnee students were higher than that of males. With respect to their age, majority (69.3 percent) of dropout returnee students were over aged. Regarding teacher's characteristics, of the total teacher involved in this study, the majority of them were matured in age (31-35 years), 64 (82%) first degree holders, and have an intermediate working experience ranging between 11-15 years.

1. In the study area students dropout rates from secondary schools were found to be 4.1, 3.8, 3.4 and 2.9 % for four (2007 to 2010) academic years respectively.

2. It was found that the rate of drop out in the study area decreased from 4.1% in 2007 to 3.8, 3.4 and 2.9 in 2008, 2009 and 2010 respectively.

3. The study also showed that the highest rate of drop out were observed in grade nine.

5. The finding of the study also portrayed that dropout rate is relatively higher among girls than boys in the study area.

6. The major in-school related factors that highly contributed to students' dropout in the study area were involvement of students in domestic work and regular absenteeism.

7. Concerning out-of school related factors, both students and teachers rated poverty, parents' lack of perceived benefit from education, peer group influence and pregnancy as high. This indicates that these are the major out-of school related factors causing students' drop out in the study area.

8. For the existing high dropout of students in this study area, out-of-school factors are the most prevalent causes than in-school factors.

9. Dependency, low productivity, low employment opportunities, inability to use new technologies, stealing, damaging properties, fighting/swearing and drug abuse were the consequences of student dropout.

5.2 Conclusion

After a close examination of the results of the study, the researcher has drawn the following conclusions. Even though the trends of dropout rate is decreasing for the past consecutive academic years (2007-2010 E.C), there is still high student dropout in the study area.   The study revealed that the key determinants that affected the pupils' decision to drop out of school in the study area were the combination of both in-school and out-of-school factors. The most pressing in- school factors caused students to dropout were involvement of students in domestic work and regular absenteeism whereas poverty, parents lack of perceived benefit from education, peer group influence and pregnancy were the core out of school factors for students to drop out. Dependency, low productivity, low employment opportunities, inability to use new technologies, stealing, damaging properties, fighting/swearing and drug abuse were the consequences of student dropout.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. The finding of the study also portrayed that the highest rate of drop out was observed in grade nine and dropout rate is relatively higher among girls than boys in the study area. Therefore, schools need to identify potential dropouts (at-risk students) timely at early stage of secondary school and apply early sustainable intervention before they dropout.

2. Schools and the local government need to work a lot on changing societal attitude on education.

3. It was revealed in the study that lack of employment opportunity has great impact on student dropout in the study area. Therefore, it is advisable for the local government to devise strategies by which more employment opportunities will be created for students who completed Secondary schools.

4. The finding of the study disclosed that involvement of students in domestic work /household chores/ was one of the major causes of student dropout. Thus, school principals need to inform parents about the detrimental effects of excessive hours worked by students during the school week. Moreover, Students need to spend most of their time on studying rather than wasting their time on household chores.

5. One of the major causes of student dropout in the study area was found to be pregnancy. Therefore, Secondary school principals need to invite health professionals to their schools and give awareness to students on the importance of family planning services.

6. The study revealed that parental lack of perceived benefit from education was one of the major causes of student dropout. Therefore, schools are advised to raise parental and community awareness on the importance of education thereby greater parental support and conducive learning environment are made at home.

7. One of the major reasons for pupils' dropout in the study area was economic problem, inability to pay school expenses. Thus, the local government has to implement poverty reduction strategies so as to reduce the problem of parent's poverty. Moreover, schools need to help economically poor students by giving school materials through community participation.

8. The finding of the study showed that peer pressure was one of the core out of

school factors for students' dropout. For this reason, parents and school leaders need to make continuous follow up and guidance to students thereby reduce peer pressure by diverting the attention of students to education.

9. Finally, the government need to construct more secondary schools close to students' homes which would, in a way, help address the problem of home school distance.

References

Adane, T.(1993). *Wastage in Primary Schools of Bahir Dar Awraja*. Unpublished M.A

     Thesis, A.A.U.

Alhassan, A. B. (1991). *Child Marriage: the Problem of Educational Development in*

     Northern States Schools of Nigeria, Muslim Education Quarterly. 8 (2) pp43-48.

Ali, I. (2007, March 7). *How child labor is kept alive in the grip of poverty.* The Fiji

     Times pp18-19

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2007). *Saving futures, saving dollars: The impact of*

     education on crime reduction and earnings. Washington, DC: Author.

Arnova, R. F. (1984). *Educational Policy in China and India: the Problem of*

     Overcoming the Work/Study Dichotomy-, Phi-Delta-Kappa 65 (7) pp473-478.

Auxier, C. (2003). Of gaps and Bridges: Educational Challenges for the South

     Pacific. Directions: *Journal of Educational Studies*, 25 (1) pp17-27.

Bickel, W. E., Bond, L., & LeMahieu, P. (1986). *Students At-Risk of not completing*

     High School. Background Report to the Pittsburgh Foundation, RA.

Bray, M. (1984). *Dropping Out from Community Schools: the Extent, the Causes and*

     Possible Remedies, University of Papua New Guinea. Educational Research Unit.

     Port Moresby.

Bridgeland, J. M., Dilulio, J. J., & Morison, K. B. (2006). *The Silent Epidemic:*

     perspectives of High school Dropouts. A report by Civic Enterprise

     in association with Pe ter D. Hart Research Associates for the Bill &

     Melinda Gates Foundation. Washington D.C.

Brimer. M. A. and Pauli, L. 1971 Wastage in Education: a World Problem, UNESCO: IBE,

     Paris.

Cann, K. T. (1982). *An Economic Evaluation of Elementary Education for Dropouts in*

     Indonesia-, Economics of Education Review 3 (1) pp67-89.

Carranza, E. (1984). *Mexican-American Cultural Assumptions and Implications*, Opinion

     Papers. California.

Carr-Hill, R. A. (1984). *Primary Education in Tanzania:* a Review of the Research,

Education Division documents No.16, SIDA, Stockholm.

Catterall, J. (1985*). On the Social Cost of Dropping Out of School.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chamie, M. (1983). *National, Institutional and Household Factors Affecting Young Girls' Schooling Attendance in Developing Societies,* Agency for International Development (IDCA)/International Centre for Research on Women, Washington D.C.

Ciano, J. N. (1982). *An Investigation of the Causes and Effects of Secondary School Drop-out in Nairobi Kenya*. African Studies in Curriculum Development and Evaluation, University of Nairobi, Nairobi.

Coleman, A. & Elman, C. (1983). *An Analysis of the Rural Urban Balance for Education in Developing Countries: a Case Study of Liberia,* Illinois, USA

Coleman, T. H. (1994). *Wastage in Basic Education in Ghana*. PBME, Ministry of Education. Accra

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Cronbach, L. J. (Ed.). (1984). *Essentials of psychological testing* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Davico, M. I. (1990). *The Repeat and Drop-out Problem: A Study in Brazil on the Role of the Teacher.* Prospectus, 20 (1) pp107-113.

Davison, J. (1993). School Attainment and Gender: Attitudes of Kenyan and Malawian Parents toward Educating Girls, *International Journal of Educational Development*. 13 (4) pp331-338.

Davison, J. & Kanyuka, M. (1992). *Girls' Participation in Basic Education in Southern Malawi,* Comparative Education Review, 36 (4) pp446-466.

Dohn, H. (1991). *Drop-out in the Danish High School (Gymnasium): an Investigation of Psychological, Sociological and Pedagogical Factors*, International Review of Education, 37 (4) pp415-428.

Dorn, S. (1993). Origins of the Dropout Problem. *History of Education Quarterly*, 33(3). (Pp. 353-373). Retrieved July 18, 2018, from http://limks.jstor.org/sici?=00182680

Duncan, W.(1988). *School Dropout in Botswana: Gender Differences at Secondary Level.* Institute of International Education, Stockholm.

Elson, D. (1991). Male Bias in Macro-Economics: The Case of Structural Adjustment in Elson. Diane (ed.) *Male Bias in the Development Process*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Englund, M. M., Egeland, B., & Collins, W. A. (2008). Exceptions to high school dropout predictions in a low-income sample: do adults make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues,* 64 (1) pp77-93.

FDRE (2004) A National Report on Progress Made in the Implementation of the Beijing Plat Form for Action (Beijing + 10) Prime Minister Office/Women's Affairs Subsector. Retrieved on October 23, 2019 from http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/Review/responses/ETHIOPIA English.pdf.

Fine, M .(1986). Why Urban Adolescents Drop into and out of Public High School. *Teachers College Record*, 87 (3) pp393-409.

Floro, M. & Wolf, J. M. (1990). *The Economic and Social Impacts of Girls' Secondary Education in Developing Countries*. USAID. Office of Education and Women in Development. Washington D.C.

Gedge, J. L. (1991). The Hegemonic Curriculum and School Drop-out: the Newfoundland Case, *Journal of Education Policy*, 6 (2): pp215-224.

Ghana, MOE/UNICEF (1994). *Action Research for Equity Improvement in Primary Schooling.* Unpublished Mimeograph, Accra.

Habtamu, W. (2002). A Study of Dropouts in Selected Secondary Schools of Two Regions in Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Education*. 22(2):33-64

Hanushek, E. A. & Lavy, V. (1994). *School Quality, Achievement Bias, and Dropout Behavior in Egypt,* Living Standards Measurement Study, Working Paper 107, World Bank, Washington D.C.

Harvey, M. W. (2001). Vocational-Technical Education: A Logical Approach to Dropout Prevention for Secondary Special Education. *Spring*, 24 (3) PP108-113.

Hruska, R. A. (2005). Public *Secondary School Dropouts in Pennsylvania, 2003-04.* Education Statistics Association, Harrisburg. Retrieved March 13, 2019,

From http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERIC_web Portal/Home. Portal? pdf.

Ilon, L. & Moock, P. (1991). School Attributes, Household Characteristics, and
Demand for Schooling: a Case Study of Rural Peru. *International Review
of Education.* 37 (4) pp429-451.

Jamison D. T. & Lockheed, M. E. (1987). Participation in Schooling: Determinants
and Learning Outcomes in Nepal-, *Economic Development and Cultural
Change*, 35 (2) pp279-306.

Katie, A. (2007). High School Dropout. *Education Week*, 26 (22), 14.

Kirui, P. K. (1982). *A Study of the Factors that Influence the Increasing Repetition
and Dropout Rates in Primary Schools in Nandi District of Kenya. African
Studies in Curriculum Development and Evaluation,* University of Nairobi.
Nairobi.

Kortering, Larry, Haring, Norris and Klockars, Alan. (1992). *The Identification of
High School Drop-out Identified as Learning Disabled: Evaluating the Utility
of a Discriminant Analysis Function,* Exceptional Children, 58 (5) pp422-435.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods & Techniques* (2nd ed.). Delhi:
New Age International Ltd.

Koul, L.(1996). *Method of Educational Research.* New Delhi: Hindustan
Offset Printers.

Laird, J. , Kienzl, G., Debell, M., & Chapman, C. (2007). *Dropout rates in the
United States: 2005 Compendium Report*. U. S. Department of Education.

Lavy, V. (1991). *Investment in Human Capital: Schooling Supply Constraints in Rural
Ghana*, Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper 93, World Bank.
Washington D.C.

Lloyd, C. B. & Gage-Brandon, A. J. (1994). High Fertility and Children's Schooling in
Ghana: Sex Differences in Parental Contribution and Educational Outcomes,
Population Studies, 48 pp293-306.

Lockheed, M.E. and A.M. Verspoor. (1991). Improving primary education in developing
countries. Washington D.C: The World Bank.

Maeregu B. & Tadesse H.(2015). The Root Cause Factors and the Status of Students Drop-
out in Public Secondary Schools of Harari Regional State, Ethiopia. *Middle
Eastern & Africa   Journal of Educational Research*, Issue 15, 15-29.

Malefoasi, G. (2005). *Youth and Mental Health in Solomon Islands: A Situational
Analysis.* Retrieved September1, 2018 from www.fspi.org.fj.

Martin, C. J. (1994). *Schooling in Mexico: Staving in or Dropping out*, Avebury,
Aldershot

Mbunda, A. M. (1983). *Investigation of the Problem of Dropout among Primary School
Pupils in Kinondoni District of Tanzania.* African Studies in Curriculum
Development and Evaluation. University of Nairobi. Nairobi.

Meiji, T. V. (1994). Second Chance Education for Maori School 'Dropouts': a Case Study
of a Community Training Centre in New Zealand. *International Journal of
Educational Development* 14 (4) pp371-384.

Melhotra, S.P.& Passi B.K. (1975). Effect of authoritarian Democratic Teacher
behavior upon liking of the students towards their teachers: *Journal Abstract of
India Education Review*

 Ministry of Education. (2004). *Ethiopia Education Sector Development
Program II Joint Review Mission Report*. Addis Ababa.

MOE and UNICEF (2012). *Study on Situation of Out of School Children* (OOSC) in
Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

Nathan, T. (2006). Dropout Nation. *Time.* 167,16, 30-40. Retrieved July 25,
2019 from
http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx? direct=true&db=aph&AN

Obe, E. O. (1980). *Educational Testing in West Africa.* Premier Press and Publishers,
Lagos.

Odebunmi, A.(1983). *Why They Drop Out of School: a Nigerian Perspective*, Research
Report. University of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania.

Omani, I. M. (1982). *Psychology and Education in Changing Societies: New Perspectives
from Tanzania,* Dares Salaam University Press, Dares Salaam.

Palmer, M. (1993). *The Meaning of School Repetition and Drop Out in Mozambican
secondary School.* Education Division Documents No.60. SIDA. Stockholm.

Patrinos, H. A. & Psacharopoulos. G. (1992). *Socioeconomic and Ethnic Determinants of Grade Repetition in Bolivia and Guatemala,* Staff Working Papers 1028. World Bank. Washington D.C.

Perera, L.H. (1981). Universality and Availability of Education at All Levels, Paper presented at the CFT/NEA/WCOTP North American Conference, Philadelphia. PA, may 14-17 1981, *World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession,* Morges, Switzerland.

Rangel, H., & Maeyer, M. D. (2008). *International Trends and Recommendations in Education in Prison.* Washington DC: U. S.

Raphael, S. (2004). *The socioeconomic status of black males: The increasing importance of incarceration.* Goldman School of Public Policy, Berkeley: University of California.

Rumberger, R.W. (1990). Second Chance for High School Dropouts in Inbar. Dan E. (ed.) Second Chance in Education: *an Interdisciplinary and International Perspective,* Falmer Press, London.

Rumberger, R. W. & Thomas, S. L. (2000). The distribution of dropout and turnover rates among urban and suburban high schools. *Sociology of Education,* Albany, Jan. 73 (1) pp39-69.

Rumberger, W. (1987). *High School Dropouts: a Review of Issues and Evidence.* A Review of Educational Research, 57 (2) pp101-121.

Safilios, R. C. & Whyte, J. (1986). *Girls and Women in Education: a Cross-National Survey of Sex Inequalities in Upbringing and in Schools and Colleges,* OECD, Paris.

Samaroo, N. K. (1991) The Political Economy of Education in Guyana: Implications for Human Rights. *Journal of Negro Education,* 60 (4) pp512-523

Sappasatta,k. (1993). *Factors Affecting School Dropout in Senior Secondary Schools of Walaita Awuraja.* Unpublished Senior Essay. Faculty of Education. AAU.

Save the Children Fiji. (2006a). *The Physical and Emotional Punishment of Children in Fiji: A Research Report.* Save the Children Fund Fiji Report, Suva, Fiji.

Schiefelbein, E. & Farrell, J P. (1978). *Eight Years of their Lives: Through Schooling to the Labour Market in Chile.* International Development Research Centre.

Ottawa.

Singh, B. (1989). Comparisons of Mathematical Creativity, Some Personality and Biographical Factors of Middle School Dropouts and Stay ins, *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 20 (6) pp855-859.

Singh, M. (2007a, June10). When child labor is not legal. *The Fiji Times*, pp16-17.

Singh, M. (2007b, March 7). Father allows son to work. *The Fiji Times,* pp1-2.

Svec, H. J. (1990). An Advocacy Model for the School Psychologist, *School Psychological International,* 11 (1) pp63-70.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tavola, H. (2000a). Secondary Education, In *Learning together: directions for education in the Fiji Islands, Report of the Fiji Islands Education Commission/Panel,* (pp 93-114). Government of Fiji, Suva.

Tavola, H. (2000b). Reforming Secondary Education. *Pacific Curriculum Network*, 9 (2) pp13-16

Taylor, N. (1989). *Failing at the First Hurdle: Initial Encounter with the Formal System of African Education in South Africa*, University of Witwatersrand. Johannesburg

Telaye, K. (1997). *Gender Specific Investigation in to the problem of High schools Dropout in the Amhara Region.* Unpublished M.A Thesis, A.A.U

Tietjen. K. (1991). *Educating Girls: Strategies to Increase Access, Persistence, and Achievement,* Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL) Project. Office of Education, USAID, Washington D.C.

Thornberry, T. M., Moore & Christenson, R. (1985). The Effect of Dropping Out of High School on Subsequent Criminal Behavior. *Criminology,* 23 pp3-18

UNESCO, (1982). *Education for Rural Development: a Portfolio of Studies: Education and Rural Community,* UNESCO, Paris.

UNESCO, (1993). *Trends and Projections of Enrolment by Level of Education, by Age and by Sex*, 1960 - 2025 (as assessed in 1993) UNESCO. Paris.

UNESCO, (2001). Education and poverty eradication. International Workshop On Education and Poverty Eradication, Kampala. From

http://www.unesco.org/education/poverty/news.shtml.

UNESCO, (2005). EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005: Education for All, the Quality
Imperative. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO, (2012). Stumbling blocks to universal primary education: Repetition rates
decline but dropout rates remain high. Global Education Digest 2012, 22.11.2012
issue UNESCO press

UNESCO, (2015). *Education for All 2015 National Review Report*: Ethiopia. The
report prepared for World Education Forum (Incheon, Republic of Korea,
19‑22 May 2015)

UNESCO, ROEAP (1984). *The Drop-out Problem in Secondary Education*: some
Case Studies, UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the
Pacific, Bangkok.

UNESCO, ROEAP (1987). Coping with Drop-out: a Handbook. UNESCO
Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok.

U.S. Department of Education, National Centre for Education Statistics. (2005). *The
Nation's Report Card: Reading 2005*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government
Printing Office.

Verhine R. E. & Mello, A. M .(1988). *Causes of School Failure: the Case
of the State of Bahia in Brazil*, Prospects. 18 (4) pp557-568.

Wechsler, S & Oakland, T. (1990). *Preventive Strategies for Promoting the Education of
Low-income Brazilian Children:* Implications for School Psychologists from
other Third World Nations, School Psychology International, 11 (2) pp83-90.

Wehlage, Gary G., Rutter, Robert A., Smith, Gregory A., Lesko, Nancy and Fernandez.
Ricardo R. (1989). Reducing the Risk: Schools as Communities of Support. Falmer
Press, London.

Weis, L. (1985). *Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College*,
Routledge and Kegan Paul. London.

Weitzman, P. F., & Lohfeld, S. E. (2009). *Combining qualitative and quantitative methods
in health research with minority elders:* Lessons from a study of dementia caregiving.
Field Methods, 12(3) pp195-208.

Wils, A. Zhao, Y. and Hartwell, A. (2006). *Looking below the surface: reaching the out-of-school children. Collaborative Working Paper CWP-02- Education Policy and Data Center,* Washington, DC (Academy for Educational Development). Retrieved from http://epdc.org/policyanalysis/static/Looking Below The Surface.pdf Wylie, R. C. (1974). The self-concept. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska

Zehle, J.(2009). *Dropout and Learning Difficulties in Government Secondary Schools in Ethiopia*. Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies.

Zimbabwe, M. E. (1991, 1993, 1994). *Annual Report of the Secretary for Education and Culture,* Harare

Appendices

Appendix A

Jimma University

College of Education and behavioral sciences

Department of educational planning and management

Questionnaire to be filled by dropout returnees

Dear Students,

I am a post graduate student pursuing a Master Degree in School Leadership at Jimma University. As part of my assessment, I am conducting a thesis proposal on "an investigation of the causes and consequences of student dropout in government secondary schools of Jimma Zone." Hence, you are kindly requested to give genuine and full responses that reflect your opinion for each item as correctly and honestly as possible. The information you provide will be used for research purpose only and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

General Direction

Please put a tick mark (√) in the space provided for close-ended questions and write your opinion for the open-ended questions.

Part One: General Information

1. Name of School _____2. Grade _____3. Age _____4. Gender _____

Part Two: Causes of student dropout

From your experience, judge the extent to which the following in school (institutional) factors contribute to dropping out of students from schools. Put tick mark (√) on your choice in the box below.

No	Items	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
1	**In school factors**					
1.1.	**Pupil related factors**					
1	Health problem					
2	Having various disabilities (hearing, visual, mental, etc)					
3	Over-age					
4	Involvement in domestic work / household chores					
5	Frequent repetition					
6	Regular absenteeism					
1.2	**Teachers related factors**					
1	Less qualified teachers					
2	Lack of encouragement given by teachers to pupils					
3	Lack of support to the students who have academic difficulties					
4	Inappropriate evaluation of pupils performance					
1.3	**School related factors**					
1	School distance from home					
2	School related expense					
3	Lack of employment					
4	Inadequacy of educational facilities (chairs, tables, separate toilets for boys and girls etc)					
5	Irrelevance of the curriculum to community needs					
6	Absence of community participation					
1.4	**Administrative factors**					
1	Poor school management					
2	Inappropriate school rules and regulation					
3	Disciplinary problems of students					
4	Passive instructional technique					

4. If you have observed other in school factors that have great impact in students' dropout, please mention them:

_____

_____

5. From your experience, judge the extent to which the following out of school (external) factors contribute to the dropping out of students from school. Put tick mark (√) on your choice in the box below.

No	Items	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
2	**Out school factors**					
2.1	**Economic factors**					
1	Poverty/ inability to pay school expenses					
2	Parents need pupils' labor for work and house hold chores					
3	Pupils involvement in income generating activities					
4	Parents lack of perceived benefits from education					
5	Drought/famine					
2.2	**Social factors**					
1	Parental attitude					
2	Parental death					
3	Family breakdown					
4	Peer group influence					
2.3	**Cultural factors**					
1	Early marriage					
2	Pregnancy during schooling					
3	Ethnic /cultural minority					

 6. If you have observed other out of school factors that have great impact in students' dropout, please mention them:

_____

_____

Section three: Consequences of students' drop out

From your experience, tick mark (√) on the consequences of students' drop out in the box below.

1= Very low 2= Low 3=Medium 4= high 5= Very high

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
I	**Economic problems**					
1	Low productivity					
2	Dependency					
3	Low employment Opportunities					
4	Inability to use new technologies					
II	**Social problems**					
1	Stealing					
2	Damaging properties					
3	Fighting/swearing					
4	Drug abuse					
5	Crime					

Thank you in deed!

Appendix B

Jimma University

College of Education and behavioral sciences

Department of educational planning and management

Questionnaire to be filled by teachers

Dear Respondents,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the cause and consequences of students' dropout in secondary schools of Jimma Zone. It also aims at identifying the major factors that leads to students' dropout and to come up with relevant strategies to solve the problem in the zone. Therefore, your genuine concern and willingness in filling the questionnaire is very essential to make the study more objective, informative and useful. I assure you that your identity and answers will be treated with utmost confidentiality and the information given shall strictly be used only for the purpose of this research.

Thank you for your co-operation.

General Direction

Please put a tick mark (√) in the space provided for close-ended questions and write your opinion for the open-ended questions.

Section One: General Information

1. Place of work:

   Name of school ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ Woreda＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

2. Career position＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿3. Age ＿＿＿4. Sex A. Male ＿＿ B. Female＿＿

5. Qualification:

   Certificate＿＿＿ Diploma ＿＿First degree ＿＿＿ Second Degree＿＿＿＿

6. Years of service:

   Below 3 years ＿＿ 3-5years＿＿ 6-10years＿＿＿ 11-15 years＿＿＿ Above 16 years＿＿＿

   Section two: **Causes of student dropout**

From your experience, judge the extent to which the following in school

(institutional) factors contribute to the dropping out of students from the school.
Put tick mark (√) on your choice in the table below.

   1= Very low 2= Low 3= Medium 4= High 5= Very high

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	**In school factors**					
1.1	**Pupil related factors**					
1	Health problem					
2	Having various disabilities (hearing, visual, mental, etc)					
3	Gender					
4	Over-age					
5	Involvement in domestic work/household chores					
6	Frequent repetition					
7	Regular absenteeism					
1.2	**Teachers related factors**					
1	Less qualified teachers					
2	Lack of encouragement given by teachers to pupils					
3	Lack of support to the students who have academic difficulties					
4	Inappropriate evaluation of pupils performance					
1.3	**School related factors**					
1	school distance from home					
2	School related expense					
3	Lack of employment					
4	Inadequacy of educational facilities (chairs, tables, separate toilets for boys and girls etc)					
5	Irrelevance of the curriculum to community needs.					
6	Absence of community participation					
1.4	**Administrative factors**					
1	Poor school management					
2	Inappropriate school rules and regulation					
3	Disciplinary problems of students					
4	Passive instructional technique					

7. If you have observed other in school factors that have great impact in student's dropout, please mention them:

_____

_____

From your experience, judge the extent to which the following out of school (external) factors contribute to the dropping out of students from the school. Put tick mark (√) on your choice in the box below. 1= Very low 2= Low 3=Medium 4= high 5= Very high

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
2	**Out school factors**					
2.1	**Economic factors**					
1	Poverty/ inability to pay school expenses					
2	Parents need pupils' labor for work and house hold chores					
3	Pupils involvement in income generating activities					
4	Parents lack of perceived benefits from education					
5	Drought/famine					
2.2	**Social factors**					
1	Parental attitude					
2	Parental death					
3	Family breakdown					
4	Peer group influence					
2.3	**Cultural factors**					
1	Early marriage					
2	Pregnancy during schooling					
3	Ethnic /cultural minority					
4	Having various disabilities (hearing, visual, Mental, etc)					

8. If you have observed other out of school factors that have great impact on students' dropout, please mention them:

_____

_____

_____

Section three: Consequences of students' drop out

From your experience, tick mark (√) on the consequences of students' drop out in the box below.

1= Very low 2= Low 3=Medium 4= high 5= Very high

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
I	**Economic problems**					
1	Low productivity					
2	Dependency					
3	Low employment Opportunities					
4	Inability to use new technologies					
II	**Social problems**					
1	Stealing					
2	Damaging properties					
3	Fighting/swearing					
4	Drug abuse					
5	Crime					

Thank you in deed!

Appendix C

Jimma University

College of Education and behavioral sciences

Department of educational planning and management

Sami-structured interview questions for heads of Woreda education offices and School Principals

Dear sir/Madam,

I am are trying to find out what people think about secondary schools and the problem of drop-out. I hope we can talk a little. I would like to ask you some questions. There is no right or wrong answer, and it is not a test or an examination. I will be very happy if you could tell me what you know and what you think honestly. Your answers will not be shown to anyone else. They will be used for research purpose only. So, I hope you will be able to help me with your answers.

Interview Questions

1. How would you describe the daily attendance of high school students in your school/woreda?

2. At what grade level most students' dropout?

3. Does the rate of dropout differ on the basis of sex? Which Sex? Why?

4. Do students get the counseling service before they dropout?

5. What do you think are the major causes of pupils' dropout in your school/woreda?

6. How does distance from home to school affect the completion of secondary education?

7. What are the subsequent effects of student dropping out on: (a) students themselves? (b) their families? (c) the community? (d) the nation?

8. As a professional, what strategies do you suggest to improve the problem of students dropouts in Government secondary schools?

Thank you in deed for your cooperation!