SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENTS’ RETENTION RATE IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MATINYANI SUB COUNTY, KITUI COUNTY, KENYA

Caroline Jedidah Makau

A Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of Degree Master of Education in Educational Planning

University of Nairobi
2019
DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented in any other university

Caroline Jedidah Makau
E55/72107/2014

This research project has been presented for examination with our approval as the University Supervisors.

Dr. Ibrahim Khatete
Senior Lecturer
Department of Educational Administration and planning,
University of Nairobi.

Dr. Rose Obae
Senior Lecturer
Department of Educational Administration and planning,
University of Nairobi.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my husband Nicholas Kitaka Wambua, my dad Christopher Makau Mutunga and my mother Beth Mueni Makau.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I thank God for enabling me to bring this work to completion. My profound gratitude to my supervisors Dr. Ibrahim Khatete and Dr. Rose Obae for guiding and encouraging me which has been of great value to this study. I am also grateful to all Lecturers in the Department of Educational Administration and Planning who laid the foundation and prepared the framework upon which this work was based on. I am also grateful to my family members who stood with me all the time and bore my absence during the entire period of undertaking my course. Thank you so much for your moral support and understanding. Lastly, I would like to record my deep appreciation to all principals, teachers and students in public secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county who took part in the study.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration...........................................................................................................................................ii
Dedication............................................................................................................................................... iii
Acknowledgement ........................................................................................................................................ iv
Table of contents ........................................................................................................................................v
List of tables ........................................................................................................................................... viii
List of figures .......................................................................................................................................... ix
Abbreviations and acronyms.................................................................................................................... x
Abstract.................................................................................................................................................. xi

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study .................................................................................................................. 1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .................................................................................................................. 5
1.3 Purpose of the Study ......................................................................................................................... 6
1.4 Objectives of the Study ..................................................................................................................... 6
1.5 Research Questions ........................................................................................................................ 6
1.6 Significance of the Study ................................................................................................................ 7
1.7 Limitations of the Study .................................................................................................................... 8
1.8 Delimitations of the Study ................................................................................................................ 8
1.9 Assumptions of the Study ................................................................................................................ 8
1.10 Definition of Significant Terms .................................................................................................... 8
1.11 Organization of the Study .............................................................................................................. 9
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction..............................................................................................................10
2.2 Overview of Student Retention ............................................................................10
2.3 Influence of Cost of Education on Students Retention .....................................11
2.4 Influence of Household Income Level on Students’ Retention .......................12
2.5 Influence of Parents Education Level on Students’ Retention .......................14
2.6 Influence of Parental Involvement in Academic on Students’ Retention .........15
2.7 Summary of Literature reviewed ........................................................................16
2.8 Theoretical Framework ......................................................................................17
2.9 Conceptual framework .......................................................................................18

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction ...........................................................................................................20
3.2 Research Design ....................................................................................................20
3.3 Target Population of the Study ...........................................................................20
3.4 Sample and Sampling Procedures ......................................................................21
3.5 Research Instruments .........................................................................................22
3.6 Data Collection Procedures ................................................................................25
3.7 Data Analysis Technique ......................................................................................25
3.8 Ethical Considerations ..........................................................................................26

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................27
4.2 Response Rate .............................................................................................................. 27
4.3 Background Information of Respondents ............................................................. 28
4.4 Influence of Cost of Education on Students Retention ...................................... 33
4.5 Influence of Household Income Level on Students Retention ......................... 39
4.6 Influence of Parents Education Level on Students Retention ......................... 43
4.7 Influence of Parental Involvement in Academic on Students Retention .......... 50
4.8 Inferential Statistics ............................................................................................... 56

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................... 57
5.2 Summary of the Study ............................................................................................ 57
5.3 Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 60
5.4 Recommendations .................................................................................................. 62
5.5. Suggestions for Further Study ........................................................................... 63

REFERENCES ........................................................................................................... 64

APPENDICES ............................................................................................................. 67

Appendix I: Introduction Letter .............................................................................. 67
Appendix II: Interview Guide for the Principals......................................................... 68
Appendix III: Questionnaire for Teachers ................................................................. 69
Appendix IV: Questionnaire for Students ................................................................. 74
Appendix V: Correlation Analysis ............................................................................. 78
Appendix VI: Authorization Letter ........................................................................... 79
Appendix VII: Research Permit .................................................................................. 80
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Sampling Matrix ........................................................................................................22
Table 4.1: Questionnaires Return Rate/interview guide ..............................................................27
Table 4.2: Education level of Principals from the scheduled interview guide .....................28
Table 4.3: Period of service for principals ...............................................................................28
Table 4.4: Gender of the Teachers .............................................................................................29
Table 4.5 Education level of teachers ......................................................................................30
Table 4.6 Teaching experience for the teachers ........................................................................30
Table 4.7: Gender of Students ....................................................................................................31
Table 4.8 Age of Students ........................................................................................................32
Table 4.9: Students’ Retention Rates .........................................................................................33
Table 4.10: Students Responses on Retention ..........................................................................34
Table 4.11: Education Costs Affecting Retention .....................................................................34
Table 4.12: Teachers Responses on Extent to which Education Costs Influence Student Retention ..................................................................................................................36
Table 4.13: Extent of Education Costs on Student Retention Rates ...........................................37
Table 4.14: Teachers’ Perceptions on Influence of Cost of Education ......................................38
Table 4.15: Students’ Perceptions on Influence of Cost of Education on retention ............39
Table 4.16: Extent of Household Income Level on Students’ Retention ............................40
Table 4.17: Type of Family .........................................................................................................41
Table 4.18: Teachers’ Perceptions on Influence of Household Income .................................42
Table 4.19: Students’ Perceptions on Influence of Household Income ................................43
Table 4.20: Responses on Influence of Parent’s Education Level ........................................45
Table 4.21: Influence of Parents Education Level on students retention .............................47
Table 4.22: Students Agreement Level on influence of Parents Education Level ..............49
Table 4.23: Responses on Influence of Parent’s Education Level ..........................................50
Table 4.24: Teacher Responses on Parental Involvement in Academics .............................51
Table 4.25: Extent of Parental Involvement in Academics influence Retention ...............52
Table 4.26: Teachers’ Perceptions on influence of Parents Education Level ......................53
Table 4.27: Students Perceptions influence of Parents Education Level .............................54
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework ................................................................. 18
Figure 4.1: Parents Education Level ............................................................. 446
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ASAL  Arid and semi-arid Areas
MOE   Ministry of Education
NACOSTI National Council of Science and Technology
NESP  National Education Sector Planning
PTA   Parent Teachers Association
SFDSE subsidized Free Day Secondary Education
SPSS  Statistical Package for Social Sciences
UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors influencing students’ retention rates in secondary schools in Matinyani Sub-County, Kitui County. The study was guided by the following research objectives; to determine the influence of cost of education on students’ retention in public secondary schools; to examine how household incomes levels influence students’ retention rate in secondary schools; to assess how the education level of parent influences the retention rate of students in secondary schools and establish how parental involvement in students’ academic activities influence students retention rate in secondary schools. The study was guided by Human Capital Theory. The study adopted descriptive survey research design. Target population comprised of 18 public secondary schools, 18 principals, 380 teachers and 600 form four students from public secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. Simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used. 6 principals, 76 teachers and 120 form four students were sample. One principal and 4 teachers were used for piloting therefore they did not take part in the final study Data was collected using questionnaires, interview guides and document analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analysis. The study findings established that; there is a significant relationship between education costs and student retention rate with a coefficient correlation value (r) of (r = 0.716, p-value=0.000), significant relationship between household income level and students’ retention (r= 0.662, p-value=0.000), insignificant relationship between parents’ education level have and student’s retention (r= 0.105, p-value=0.514) and significant relationship between parents’ involvement in their children academic activities and students retention (r= 0.590, p-value=0.003). The recommendations from the study is that: the communities should be empowered to start off income generating activities to alleviate poverty and enable families increase their income as this will enable them to meet the costs, The Government should sensitize parents especially in rural areas to fully understand and appreciate the importance of completion of secondary education and the principals should organize academic clinics in the schools more often and create a plat form where individual subject teachers meet with students and their parents. The parents, teachers and students need to work in unison so that the discipline and academic progress of the students are monitored for proper guidance in order to ensure that they are retain in school. The school management can also ensure that they integrate programme that ensure close monitoring of the students by the parents and sensitizing the parents on its usage.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Education is a vital process that ensures one acquires skills, knowledge, values and attitudes. This is facilitated through the teaching and learning process. Education is key to the society as it helps individuals and the country in developing socially upright, moral and ensure the development of the economy. The school going children need to be motivated in order for them to anticipate to get educated. Education increases understanding and respect of other interrelationship among nations. A self-disciplined individual is made by proper education and appreciates work.

Secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) faces many challenges. Demand for access is increasing dramatically, as primary enrollment is becoming universal. Achievement of the Dakar and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) depended on part on expanding secondary school systems (Lewin, 2008). Secondary schooling can provide access to abstract thinking and analytic competencies that enhance competitiveness in knowledge-based economic activities in a globalized economy. In 2005, 33 million students were enrolled in secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa, an increase of 59 percent since 2012.

Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) lags behind other regions in the proportion of its labor force completing secondary school level of education. The average Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) at this level rose from 24 percent to 32 percent during the period. Increases were substantial in Benin, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Guinea, Mali, Mozambique
and Uganda, which recorded average annual increases of about 10 percent or above in secondary (UNESCO, 2008). However, still in Sub-Saharan Africa, Participation levels in secondary education remained low (GER below 20 percent) in 2005 in many countries, including Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Mozambique, the Niger, Rwanda and Uganda, while Mauritius, Seychelles and South Africa had ratios of about 90 percent or above.

The overall GER in secondary education masks disparities between its two levels, with participation often much higher in lower secondary (38 percent in 2005) than in upper secondary (24 percent). In Kenya secondary schools sponsorship is an initiative by the non-government organizations aimed at helping learners from poor backgrounds to obtain education. This is also aimed at ensuring that learners are retained in school after enrolment. Non completion of secondary schooling continues to be a matter of concern for policy makers and practitioners worldwide (Gray & Hackling, 2009). The Concern related to increasing the time a learner stays in school is a global issue.

At the beginning of 1990s was marked by several international conferences emphasizing on the importance of education. At the Jomtien world conference on Education for All (EFA) in 1990, most developing countries confirmed their commitment to provide to their school age children, universal access to the first cycle of education. Following this declaration, enrolment increased at the primary school level throughout the developing world increased. Unfortunately, the Jomtien conference did not pay much attention to the consequences of enrolment expansion at
the primary school level in relation to the resources needed for secondary schools. However, it was clear then that in many developing countries, secondary school participation rates could not grow rapidly without changes in the structure and the nature of funding (Lewin, 2001). This made many government bodies in the world to review how secondary education was going to benefit the poor and thus a lot of bursaries and scholarships were availed.

In Singapore, the Ministry of education has a bursary scheme in place known as Edusave Merit Bursary which is funded by the government for learners whose household income is less than $4000 a month. They provide $300 for secondary 1 to 5. Eligibility is for learners who are already in secondary school and whose performance are good that is 25% in a stream (MoE, 2012). This goes a long way to retain learners who could have otherwise dropped due to lack of school fees. The non-government organizations provide funding to take care of educational needs of disadvantaged learners both through the YPLA’s funding formula and through support to help young people meet the costs of participating in education and training post-1619 (YPLA, 2012). This further helps learners to be retained in schools. In India, the National Scholarship Scheme has been implemented since 1961. The objective of this Scheme is to provide scholarships to the brilliant but poor learners so that they can pursue their studies in spite of poverty.

Researchers such as Daudi (2016), Chung (2014), Afridi (2011) have been interested in understanding why a strong relationship between household income and educational attainment exist at virtually all levels of schooling. The likelihood of
students from low income earning families whose parents have not attended college would have low retention rate of their children in school due to the inability to pay for lunch, transport, uniform and maintenance costs in education despite the high investment in education by the government. The parents with high incomes are likely to retain their students in school.

Abungu (2015) in his research stated that education is a social, economic, civil and political right. Putting a strong justification for realization of a near 100 percent retention rate of learners through all levels of education. In Japan it was noted that measures that address socio-economic gaps among families must be provided by government to offer learners from unfortunate families the opportunity to be retained in school just like those from well to do families. The constituency Development fund offices and the county governments are giving bursaries to the needy students so that they can be retained in school. Since 1990, the government has renewed its commitment to developing education priorities including provision of universal access to basic education, increasing retention and progression rates throughout the education system, improving the relevance and quality of education and responding to the demand for governance and efficient management. The provision of education at all levels is a partnership between the government, communities, private sector and civil society (religious organizations and NGOS (UNESCO, 2018).

Secondary education aims at: all round mental, moral, and spiritual development of the learner and building a firm foundation for further education, enabling the learner to choose with confidence and cope with vocational education after school,
acquisition of national patriotism, self-respect, self-reliance, co-operation, adaptability, sense of purpose, integrity and self-discipline and consideration to others, loyalty and service to society and to the world. Schools issue each student a school leaving certificate which reflects observed abilities and character development in addition to the results from the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC). When the learners are not retained in school only a few of the aims are attained. This can only be achieved by retaining the learners in school.

A report by white into school retention as quoted by Nthiga (2014) summarized the position that compared to young people who complete secondary schooling, those who do not finish secondary schooling are more likely to experience extended periods of unemployment, obtain low paid and low unskilled jobs, they are more likely to earn less, rely on government assistance and not likely to participate in community life. Similarly, a country incurs a loss whenever learners are unable to be retained in any education sector. The drop out signifies unfulfilled aim, objective and goal for the individual, community and nation as a whole. For every drop out a country loses potential work force towards national targets for attaining national development strategies.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
The Kenyan government is committed to ensuring all the school going children acquire education since it is a basic right, as stated by the Kenyan constitution. Despite the effort by government in implementing the Free Day Secondary Education the retention of learners in schools is still a challenge. Education is important for poverty reduction because it empowers the poor and any other vulnerable members of
the society. However, secondary education which is one of the key pillars of poverty eradication in Kenya is hampered by an increasing number of school dropouts.

The data obtained from sub-county director of education, Matinyani Sub-County between year 2013 and 2018 shows that the number of students enrolled in secondary schools was higher than the number of students who sat for KCSE in the area in all the five years cohort wise. In addition, there is no study carried out in Matinyani sub-county on influence of socio-economic factors on students’ retention and hence necessitated the need for this study.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors influencing students’ retention rate in secondary schools in Matinyani Sub-County, Kitui County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
The study aimed at achieving the following objectives:

i. To determine the influence of cost of education on students’ retention rate in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county.

ii. To examine how household incomes levels influence students’ retention rate in secondary school.

iii. To assess how the level of education of parent influences the retention rate of students in secondary schools.

iv. To establish how parental involvement in students’ academic activities influence students’ retention rate in secondary schools.
1.5 Research Questions

The research sought to answer the following questions:

i. To what extent does cost of education influence the retention rate of learners in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county?

ii. To what extent does household income influence students’ retention rate in secondary schools?

iii. To what extent does parental education level influence students’ retention rate in secondary schools?

iv. How does parental involvement in students’ academic affairs influence students’ retention rate in secondary schools?

1.6 Significance of the Study

Ministry of education (MOE) might find the study important on the extent of retention of learners in Matinyani sub-county and compare it to other regions. The ministry of Education can use the findings to determine the success of the free tuition fee program in the area. The educational planners will be able to check the completion rates of learners who were enrolled in a particular period and know the social economic factors that are leading to low retention rates. The administrators might find the challenges facing the learners and work with the relevant bodies in addressing the challenges so that learners remain in school. Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) might find the study useful to help designing relevant curriculum for in-service training for teachers on the policies that help in the retention of learners. Data obtained from the study might be used as a basis for future research.
1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study was carried out in Matinyani sub-county and not all learners were involved. The learners were afraid to reveal some information concerning the variable while the teachers and administrators were not willing to give correct information to try and hide the weaknesses in their institution. The researcher used more than one instrument for data collection for example by using observation method to ascertain some of the information given. The respondents were also assured that data collected would only be used for research purposes and their identity would remain concealed.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

In this study only those schools in Matinyani sub-county were studied. Only principals, teachers and students were involved. Parents were not involved in the study.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

i. The study assumed that the students’ have similar characteristics but the parents are different.

ii. The study assumed that, the secondary school staff and students would be willing to offer the information freely and the findings generated from the schools could be generalized to all other sub-counties.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms

Access refers to the opportunity availed for one to enter education and training

Equity refers to being fair and impartial in providing equal opportunities for access to education and training for all
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**Parental involvement** refers to the participation of parents in the academic activities of the students in secondary school

**Retention** refers to ability of students to remain and progress in school until they complete their secondary education cycle

**School environment** refers to the conditions inherent to the school that either limit or enhance the involvement of students in order to retain them in school

**Tuition fee** refers to fees charged to cater for instruction or instructional material

**1.11 Organization of the Study**

The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one covers introduction, which comprises of background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definition of significant key terms in the study and organization of the study. Chapter two consist of Literature Review which comprises of Introduction, overview of retention, influence of cost of education, household income, parent’s education, parental involvement, summary of related literature reviewed, theoretical and conceptual framework. Chapter three covers research methodology with subheadings; introduction, research design, target population, sampling procedure and sample size, description of research instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter four covers data analysis, presentation and interpretation. Chapter five presents summary, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter focused on literature review related to the study on factors influencing students ‘retention. It covers; overview of students’ retention, influence of cost of education, household income level, parent education level and influence of parental involvement. It also covers theoretical framework, summary and knowledge gap and conceptual framework.

2.2 Overview of Student Retention

Student’s retention happens when a learner enrolls in school and completes the grades. In reference to secondary schools in Kenya, students’ retention refers to students being retained in school up to the end of the four years of secondary education (Gale Encyclopedia of Education, 2011). Brown and Parks (2012) found out that poor and credit challenged children had higher chances of dropping out of school than other children. Eisenmon (2017) study on wastages in secondary education found out that dropout rates in developing countries often are quite high. Ncube (2014) study on rural day schools in Zimbabwe found that the number of students dropping from a level increased with the level of schooling.

Sessional paper No. 1 on Education, Training and Research indicates a transition rate of 70 percent from primary to secondary education cycle and this is an indication that approximately 30 percent of the pupils nationally are unable to proceed to secondary schools. Some of the policies and strategies put in place by the government include the implementation of FPE, mobilizing parents and communities through awareness
creation, infrastructure support providing additional support to low cost boarding schools in Arid and semi-Arid Lands (ASAL’s) and taking affirmative action. Since the provision of education to all Kenyans is fundamental to the success to the governments overall development strategy and its long term objective of providing every Kenyan with basic quality education, every effort is, therefore, required to sustain the current enrolment and retention and address the key issues of access, equity and quality (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

2.3 Cost of Education and Students Retention

The cost of education is constantly rising due to inflation and socio-economic dynamics of the society (Malome, 2012). School costs includes cost of remedial classes, motivation fee, salaries of PTA teachers and infrastructure fund among others. Many children are forced to miss classes because they are at home now and then collecting money (Dalton, 2009). Brown and Park (2012) found out that in rural China, incapability to pay school levies was the reason for the dropout of 47% of girls while only 33% of boys dropout in elementary schools; in junior secondary high school, fees were half for the girls but only 8% for the boys.

Kadzamira and Rose (2013) established that pupils in Malawi were less likely to attend school because the cost of schooling is too high. Laboke (2010) indicated that there were traditionally other sources of education financing in Ghana and these were being given serious attention for example, parents and guardians are being encouraged to give support to schools through payment of levies to be used to fund specific running cost of schools. Hunter & May (2012) study in South Africa found
that school levies were significant reason for the dropout rate of 27 percent of boys and 30 percent of girls.

Mbugua (2009) said that one of the areas where PTA funds were utilized in Kenya was in developing school physical facilities. PTA levies are instrumental in provision of physical facilities in school to enable teaching-learning process to take place. A study done in Kenya by Obua (2011) on 109 primary school leavers found out that only 17 progressed to secondary school, while 20 of those who would have liked to transit sighted auxiliary costs like PTA levies as the greatest challenge. The government financing of education does not consider PTA levies on education which affects greatly students’ retention rates in secondary schools in Kenya.

2.4 Household Income Level and Students’ Retention

Daudi (2016) revealed that extreme poverty in families made them not able to take their children to schools or unable to maintain them in school and they are always sent home due to lack of school fees. Abdullahi (2005) argues that poor families are unable to pay school fees for all their children and these children dropout of school after their siblings have reached school age since all cannot be supported at the same time. According to UNESCO (2001), child labour has become crucial for family survival. This is because high poverty levels of parents and hidden cost of education must be met by the child, parents view the benefits of education as for fetched and choose to pre-occupy their children as casual labour where immediate income is guaranteed.

Chugh (2014) study in India in patterns of access and non-access in slums in Bangalore revealed that the income of the father was linked to the continuity or
discontinuity of the child in school. He further established that children may be called on to supplement the household’s income, either through wage-earning employment themselves or taking on additional tasks to free up other household members for work if income levels are low.

Afridi (2011) assessed the effects of feeding programme on enrolment and attendance of school in Madhya Pradesh, India where out of the 74 schools surveyed the attendance was found to have increased by 10.5% in schools which implemented the feeding programme. Therefore, provision of school meal increases participation. This also implies that in schools where meals are not provided and parents cannot afford to cater for lunch, their children opt to stay at home decreasing participation rate.

World Bank (2014) urged that although several countries in sub- Saharan Africa have abolished school fees, significant costs remain including cost of providing uniform for a child, students are reprimanded by teachers and are likely to be sent away from school for failure to wear school uniform. Stasavage (2005) study in Uganda established that parents who could not afford to buy exercise and textbooks retained their children home thus affecting retention in school. Dachi and Garrett (2013) study on financial circumstances surrounding children’s school enrolment in Tanzania established that the main barrier to sending children to school was financial and their inability to pay fees. Both statistical data and empirical research showed that students from better off households were more likely to remain in school, while those who are poorer were more likely never to have attended, or to drop out once they have enrolled. According to EFA (2009), Kenya has the largest percentage of her children in both primary and secondary school of which 13 percent drop out of school at any
given time due to poverty, early marriages, HIV/AIDS pandemic and poor learning environment.

2.5 Parents Education Level and Students’ Retention

World Bank Report (2011) notes that literate persons are more likely to enroll and retain their children in schools than illiterate parents hence regions with highest proportions of illiterate adults have fewer chances of supporting the education progress of their children. De Graaf and Ganjeboom (2010) study in Netherlands established that pupils with highly educated parents proceed to higher secondary education which is higher number compared to pupils with middle or low-educated parents. This is so because less educated parents do not know the private and social benefits of investing in education. Such parents may not encourage their children to proceed with their education. United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural organization (UNESCO, 2011) carried out a similar study in Latin America and found out that children whose mothers have secondary schooling remain in school for longer periods than those whose mothers lack secondary education and are more likely to progress to secondary education.

Al Samarrai (2008) study in Tanzania suggested that educated mothers give preference to girls’ schooling, implying that mothers have a relatively stronger preference for their daughters’ education and that their education affords them either increased household decision-making power or increased economic status. United Nations International Children Education Fund (2013) report showed that in sub-Saharan countries children of educated women are much more likely to go to school hence. Onyango (2010) asserted that educated parents appreciate the value of
education more than illiterate ones and normally assist their children to progress in education both morally and materially.

2.6 Parental Involvement in Academic Activities and Students’ Retention

Lezotte (2001) asserted that family participation in school activities is a common phrase utilized to explain a number of events, plans and programs that calls upon all parents to back up pupils’ learning and the learning institution. Children whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision making and are generally more involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school. Snow, Barnes and Chandler (2013) carried out a study on home influences on literacy achievement among children in England. Findings established that that the single variable most positively connected to all literacy skills was formal involvement in parent-school activities such as PTA participation, attending school activities and serving as a volunteer.

A study done by Donkor (2010) on parental involvement in education in Ghana established that positive parental value of education is influenced by the parents’ awareness of the relationship between education and the future economic well-being of individuals, their level of participation in school activities, the degree to which they understand their role in supporting their children’s schooling and a consciousness of their empowerment in making decisions. Onyango (2012) asserted that, improving relationship with the community is among the managerial roles of a school head teacher since the approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement hence the primary school head teacher need to concentrate on better relationship between the school and the community.
2.7 Summary of Literature reviewed

This section provides a review of related literature on factors influencing students’ retention rates. Studies done by Kadzamira and Rose (2013) established that pupils were less likely to attend school because the cost of schooling is too high; Chugh (2014) revealed that the income of the father was linked to the continuity or discontinuity of the child in school; Ganzeboom (2010) established that pupils with highly educated parents proceed to higher secondary education which is higher number compared to pupils with middle or low-educated parents and Snow, Barnes and Chandler (2013) established that that the single variable most positively connected to all literacy skills was formal involvement in parent-school activities such as PTA participation, attending school activities, and serving as a volunteer.

Majority of these studies were conducted outside of Kenya and among the few that have been conducted in Africa and in Kenya, none of them has addressed the influence of cost of education, school policies, household income, parental level of education and parental involvement in education on retention in secondary schools. In addition, some studies were conducted in primary schools and used only one research design. The present study employed both quantitative and qualitative research designs and collected data using both questionnaires and interview schedules. It is believed questionnaire and interview schedule as data collection instruments yields more data for the study. There is also no similar study carried out in Matinyani sub-county. This current study aimed at filling these research gaps.
2.8 Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the Human Capital Theory which was developed by Schultz (1971). The theory assumes that education is highly instrumental and even essential to enhance productivity of a population. This implies that an educated population is a productive population. This theory gives emphasis to how education raises the level of cognitive stock of economically productive human beings capacity. Human is a product of intrinsic capabilities and investment in human capital through education which the proponent of this theory considered education to be worthwhile than physical capital.

The main limitation of human capital theory is that it ignores the social and moral purposes of education. These might include living ethically and peacefully in a diverse society, and developing a commitment to social justice. This theory is very relevant to the study as it justifies considerable input to education in order to reap maximum benefits of investing in human capital for national development. This initiative may improve access of education, reduce drop-out rates hence increasing completion rate of learners. Improvement in education qualification is a basis for the foundation of acquisition of skills that enable individuals to create and acquire wealth. This is an important component in the national strategy for reducing poverty and achieving millennium development goals.
2.9 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework in Figure 2.1 shows the relationship between the independent and dependent variable.

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework shows that there is a relationship between social-economic factors and students’ retention. It shows that secondary school retention rate might improve if all education costs are met, if the household income level increases, literate parents who also value education and are aware of the economic benefits of education
and if the parents are actively involved in their children economic activities’ like interest in their academic performance and taking part in school activities. However, the students’ gender and culture might also affect retention whereby girls who get pregnant drop out of school more often. Additionally, some cultures do not value girls’ education and they only invest in boys’ education.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher focused on methodology that was employed in the study. This chapter covers the research design, target population, sample size, instrumentation (pilot testing, validity and reliability of instruments), data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
According to Kothari (2008) a research design refers to the plan of research so as to get answers to research questions. This study employed descriptive research design. Descriptive research design was used since it provides insights into the research problem by describing the variables of interest. It was used for defining, estimating, predicting and examining associative relationships. Descriptive research makes use of six Ws; who, what, when, where, why, way of research and this significantly helped the present study.

3.3 Target Population of the Study
Target population is defined as all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research study. The target population for this study was 18 public secondary schools, all the 18 principals, 380 teachers and 600 form four students from public secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county (Sub-county director of education Matinyani sub-county, 2019).
3.4 Sample and Sampling Procedures

A sample is a miniature proportion of target population selected for analysis (Orodho, 2012). Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) asserted that 10 to 30 percent of population is enough for sampling. In this study, simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used. The researcher therefore sampled 20 percent of the students hence 120 form four students. Each school therefore produced 24 students. For every school, the researcher prepared 48 papers marked yes and no. The papers were then mixed up and the students were asked to pick them. The students who picked yes participated in the study while those who picked no did not participate in the study.

Since the target population for principals and teachers was accessible and easily manageable, the study used purposive sampling where the entire target population for the principals and teachers participated in the study as respondents. This sample size was acceptable as noted by Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) that when the target population does not exceed 100, sampling the whole population is suitable. Therefore, 6 principals, 76 teachers and 120 students took part in the study but one principal and four teachers were left out for piloting. The remaining 5 principals and 72 teachers all took part in the study. The study comprised of 197 respondents.
Table 3.1: Sampling Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sampling procedure</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Simple random and Purposive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Simple random and Purposive</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Simple random</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research Instruments

Research instruments are the instruments used for data collection. The study used questionnaires and interview guide as the tool for data collection. A questionnaire entails of questions which are either close-ended or open-ended. The researcher designed a questionnaire with both open ended and close ended questions. The research used questionnaire because they enable collection of large quantity of data inexpensively from a wide range of participants spread extensively in a geographic space. Questionnaires also give enough time to the respondents to think about the questions and to give well thought answers (Kothari, 2008).

Questionnaires were used to collect data from teachers and students. The questionnaire was divided into six parts. Section A covered background information, section B covered influence of school cost, section C covered influence of household income, section D covered influence of parents’ education level and section E covered influence of parental involvement on students’ retention. The researcher used interview guides to collect data from the principals.
The interview guides collected information on background information of the principals, influence of school cost, household income, parents’ education level and influence of parental involvement on student’s retention. The researcher also used document analysis. The document included class attendance register which the researcher believed it would help her establish whether constant absenteeism lead to school dropout, admission book which helped the researcher to assess whether all the students admitted in the school completed secondary education or they dropped out of school and fees register which is one of the factors which contribute to school drop-out, putting the researcher in a position to establish the consistency of inability to pay fees and whether students who experienced challenges in paying fees completed or dropped out of school.

3.5.1 Validity of research instruments

The researcher carried out a pilot test on the research tools where the instrument were tested for validity and reliability. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008), a pre-test comprises of between 1 to 10 percent of the target population. Therefore a pilot study was carried out in one school therefore one principal, four teachers and ten students. The students, teachers and the principal in the pilot test did not take part in the final data collection.

Kothari (2010) asserts that validity indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and can also be thought as utility. The researcher used content validity to measure the degree to which data collected using a particular instrument represents a specific domain of indicators or content of
particular concept. The assessment of content validity of a measure was carried by two research experts from the department of education, University of Nairobi. These research experts helped to determine whether the sets of items perfectly represented the concept of study and also sought help from the supervisor so as to improve content validity.

3.5.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) define reliability of the research instrument as its level of internal consistency over time. Reliability was tested through test re-test technique in order to improve reliability of the instrument. This involved administering the same questionnaires twice to the respondents in the pilot sample after two weeks. A Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient formula was used.

\[
    r = \frac{\Sigma xy - \Sigma x \Sigma y}{N} \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2)}{N} \left( \frac{(\Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2)}{N} \right)}
\]

Where \( r \) = person correlation co-efficient

X = result from the first test

Y = results from the second test

N = number of observations

The correlation coefficient obtained was 0.7762 for teachers questionnaire and 0.714 for students’ questionnaire. This means the research instruments could be relied upon for this study. A correlation coefficient of between 0.7 to 1 is considered reliable (Mugenda & Mugenda 2008).
3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher obtained a clearance letter from the University of Nairobi, from the Department of Education, which was used in getting a research permit from National Council of Science and Technology (NACOSTI). After checking research instruments validity and reliability, the study proceeded to the field for the purpose of data collection. A letter was sent to the sub-county director of education Matinyani sub-county and also to the principals of the participating secondary schools to seek formal clearance to engage in the study in the particular area. Before data administration, the respondents consent was sought. After the respondents’ acceptance to participate in the study, research instruments were provided to them. The questionnaires were collected after the respondents finished filling them. The researcher personally conducted the face to face interviews with the principals of the secondary schools. Information was collected through taking notes.

3.7 Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis involves categorizing, ordering, manipulating and analysing raw data to get answers to the research questions (Kothari, 2004). The completed questionnaires were checked for completeness as part of preparation for analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 and presented by using frequency tables and graphs. Qualitative data that was generated in the study from open ended questions was organized in themes, categories and patterns, grouped through content analysis and then tabulated while responses from the interview guides were recorded and then presented in narratives. Pearson correlation co-
efficient (r) was used to test for relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable

3.8 Ethical Considerations

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) ethical considerations are important for any research. Ethical research is considered as one that does not harm and which gives informed consent and respects the rights of individuals being studied. Ethical issues form an important component of research as far as conduct of researchers is concerned. The ethical consideration are ensuring anonymity and confidentiality; no harm to the participants; voluntary participation, avoiding deception and fair reporting (Babbie, 2009). Ethics were observed before, during and after carrying out the study.

Full disclosure of the purpose of the study was made to the respondents by way of a letter of introduction. The respondents were assured of confidentiality of the information provided and anonymity of the source of data as the questionnaire did not require disclosure of identity. To facilitate objectivity in the research, efforts were made to ensure that personal bias of the researcher and the research assistants did not interfere with the research process and that all parties were given a fair consideration. In reporting the findings, the researcher accurately represented data collected and it was used only for the purposes of this study. Best and Khan (2011) argued that researchers should not falsify data or information in order to suit their view but they should use the information given by their respondents when reporting research findings.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis, presentation and discussion of findings. The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors influencing students’ retention rates in public secondary schools in Matinyani Sub-County, Kitui County. The study was organized based on the study research questions including influence of cost of education, household income levels, education level of parent as well as parental involvement in students’ academic activities as measures of students’ retention in public secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The responses are analyzed and presented into frequencies, percentages tables and figures.

4.2 Response Rate

During the study, questionnaires and interview guides were administered to the principals, teachers and students. The response rate is presented in Table 4.1

Table 4.1: Questionnaires return rate/interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire administered</th>
<th>Questionnaire returned</th>
<th>Return rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals (interview guide)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 indicates that the average questionnaire return rate was well above 70 percent which according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) is adequate for analysis.
4.3 Background Information of Respondents

The study focused on the background information of the principals, teachers and students. The background information of principals concentrated on education level and period of serving as a principal.

Table 4.2: Education level of principals from the scheduled interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors’ degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’ degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the scheduled interview guide, Table 4.2 shows that 60 percent of the principals had attained bachelor’s ‘degree. This shows that being a secondary level of education, the principals are putting effort to move to higher levels of education and acquire more school administration skills. The principals are well trained hence in a position to advice students on importance of education which might contribute to increase in retention rates of the students.

Table 4.3: Period of service for principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interviews with the principals, it was found that 60 percent of principals had served for less than 6 years. The principals who had worked more than 6 years had better management skills than those who had worked less than six years. The
principals who had worked more than 6 years had a vast experience in school leadership thus in a good position to curb drop out of students in their school contributing to high retention.

The background information of teachers concentrated on gender, education level and teaching experience which were recorded in the following tables.

**Table 4.4: Gender of the teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in 4.3 Table show that 55 percent of the teachers were male. This shows that both genders of teachers were well represented in the study although male teachers are more as compared to female teachers in the secondary schools. The findings also show that one third gender rule was observed in employing teachers in the study area. The Kenyan constitution stipulates that not more than two thirds (67.7%) of any public institution should be drawn from one gender. A principal from one school confirmed that both genders were in the institution and the students had role models hence this would enhance their retention in school. In most schools the gender was distributed well in the administration. In one school the principal was a male and the deputy principal female.
Findings from table 4.5 show that 73.3 percent of teachers had attained bachelors of education. This implies that the teachers had attained high level of education thus in a position to advice students on importance of education which encourages them to remain in school till completion. One of the teachers in a school reported that students were seeing the teachers as their role models and was giving them motivation to remain in school.

The results in table 4.6 show that 50 percent of the teachers had a teaching experience of between 5-7 years. This implies that the teachers had been teaching for a considerable number of years to understand the factors influencing students’ retention in secondary schools. One of the principals during the interview confirmed that the teachers with more teaching experience were helping the schools in the guidance and counselling of the defiant students hence helping the students to remain in school though some would still go away. Those who had served more years also had different
methodologies of approaching concepts and would handle students in a better way than those with less experience.

The background information of students concentrated on gender and age. The researcher sought the students’ gender to assess whether gender was related to school dropout and also age since old students who have repeated classes have a tendency of dropping out as compared young students. Table 4.7 presents the students’ demographic information.

**Table 4.7: Gender of students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that majority of the students’ 60 percent were male. This implies that there was a variance in gender distribution of students which could be due to early pregnancies and marriages which forces girls to drop out of school. The finding is in agreement with data obtained from document analysis which shows that the class registers had more boys as compared to girls. Information from admission registers showed that the schools had enrolled more boys. The number of students who did KCSE in the schools under study varied from the number of students who were enrolled. In a school it was found out that the students enrolled in form one 2016 were 48 and those that were in form 4 2019 were 40. During the interview with a principal confirmed that there were five girls who had dropped out due to pregnancies while the four boys had dropped due to drugs and lack of fees.
Table 4.8 Age of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings as recorded in table 4.8 show that 73.3 percent of the students were aged between 18-20 years and 26.7 percent were aged more than 20 years. The admission registers showed that majority of the students in form four were in the age bracket of 17-20 years of age. This implies that the students were old enough to understand the concept of the study. This could also mean that there are some children in the study area who go to school at a late age whereby some old students drop out of school since they feel shy learning with younger students. One principal during the interview revealed that those students who were dropping out were above 20 years and most of the indiscipline cases were from the overage students.

In order to understand the students’ retention rates in the study area, principals were asked to state their view on the retention rate in their school in the last four years. Findings were presented in Table 4.9.
Findings in Table 4.9 show that 60 percent of the principals rated the retention rates in their school moderate. From the document analysis it is observed that not all the students who were admitted in the secondary school completed secondary school education within the stipulated time period of four years. The document analysis revealed that the students dropped out due to lack of school fees, indiscipline cases, poor performance and involvement in irresponsible sexual behaviors leading to pregnancy in girls who eventually drop out of school. This shows that there are several cases of drop out in the public secondary schools in the study area leading to low retention rates. One principal revealed that they had expelled 3 girls due to pregnancies, 3 had indiscipline cases and 5 could not pay the school fees hence they dropped out. These made the enrolled number of students be higher than those that were completing their 4 years of secondary education.

### 4.4 Influence of Cost of Education on Students Retention

The first research objective was to determine the influence of cost of education on students’ retention rate in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The researcher sought to find out from the students whether there were some colleagues who failed to return to school after being sent home to collect school fees. Findings are presented in Table 4.10
Table 4.10: Students responses on retention rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.10 show that 85.7 percent of the students indicated that they knew of colleagues who failed to return to school after being sent home to collect money to settle school costs. This was supported by one principal who said that whenever students are send home for fees some would spend time at home and this would affect their retention. The finding is in agreement with Brown and Park (2012) who found out that incapability to pay school levies was the reason for the dropout and low retention rates.

The students and teachers further listed some of the school costs that affect students’ retention in secondary schools. The school costs were summarized and are presented in Table 4.11

Table 4.11: Education costs affecting retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cost</th>
<th>Teachers Frequency</th>
<th>Teachers Percentage</th>
<th>Students Frequency</th>
<th>Students Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School development fees</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club fees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination fees</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform fees</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity fee</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.11 show that majority of the teachers (86.7%) and students (81%) indicated school development fees as the major costs in public secondary schools which greatly affect students’ retention. From the principals during the interviews it was established that an average of Kshs. 2500 was charged on development in the schools. When some students go to collect the fees they don’t report back. Other costs affecting students’ retention were identified as club fees, examination costs, remedial teaching fees, uniform fees and activity fees.

The principals were also asked to list some of the key education costs that affects students’ retention in their respective school. The sampled principals unanimously agreed that the costs of education led students to drop out leading to low retention. One of the principals said that, “some parents are not able to pay school levies to cover education costs like development fee, examination fees, remedial teaching, academic trips and activity fees. This forces the school administration to send the students home and some of them do not come back to school.” This implies that there are various school costs which affect students’ retention rates. The finding concurs with Dalton (2009) who found out that the key school costs which influence students’ retention includes cost of remedial classes, motivation fee, salaries of PTA teachers and infrastructure fund.

Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which education costs influence student retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Teachers responses on extent to which education costs influence student retention rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Costs</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs registration fees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport fees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform cost</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial tuition fee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination fees</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity fees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60

Findings in Table 4.12 show that extra school levies affect the dropout rates. The activity fees to a very great extent affected most students by 75 percent. From the document analysis it was established that amounts charged on the education costs were as follows: clubs fee was Kshs.200, transport Kshs.500, Uniform Kshs.2000, activity Kshs.300 and remedial fee Kshs.2000

The finding from one of the principals during the interview said that “the school costs greatly influence retention of secondary school students since some parents are not able to adequately meet all education costs.” The finding is also in agreement with majority of the students 74.3 percent who indicated that school costs influence students’ retention to a very great extent as shown in Table 4.9 below. This implies that school costs force some students to drop out of school before sitting for form four exams. The finding is in agreement with Kadzamira and Rose (2013) who established that learners were less likely to attend school because the cost of schooling is too high.
Students were also asked to indicate the extent to which education costs influence student retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.13

Table 4.13: Extent of education costs on student retention rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 4.13 show that 74.3 percent of the students indicated that education costs influence student retention to a very great extent. The finding shows that parents’ inability to adequately meet students’ financial needs affects students’ retention in secondary schools. One principal during the interview reported that majority of the students would be send home and not come back. The finding concurs with Hunter and May (2012) who found that school levies were significant reason for the dropout rate.

The teachers were asked to tick on the degree of agreement on listed statements on influence of cost of education on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.14

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree.
Table 4.14: Teachers’ perceptions on influence of cost of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School fees is a major obstacle to students’ retention</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are often sent home to collect school fees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School levies are significant reason for dropout</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary costs are the greatest obstacle to retention</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60

Findings in Table 4.14 show that 85 percent agreed that students are often sent home to collect school fees. This implies that the costs of education force some students to drop out hence reducing retention rates. During the interview with one principal he confirmed that some students would go home to collect the fees and not come back to school. This finding is in support of Obua (2011) study which revealed that auxiliary costs affects greatly students’ retention rates in secondary schools in Kenya.

The researcher also asked the students’ to tick on the degree of agreement on listed statements on influence of cost of education on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.15

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree
Table 4.15: Students’ perceptions on influence of cost of education on retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>UD</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School fees is a major obstacle to</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are often sent home to collect</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School levies are a significant reason</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary costs are the greatest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstacle to retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.15 indicate that 87.6 percent of students agreed that school levies are a significant reason for drop out in secondary schools. This result concurs with the teachers’ results that the cost of education affects retention where they reported that school levies affected retention rates in school. The finding is in consistent with Hunter & May (2012) study which found that school levies were significant reason for the dropout rate.

4.5 Influence of Household Income Level on Students Retention rate

The second research objective was to examine how household income levels influence students’ retention in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The teachers and students were asked to indicate the extent to which household income level affect students’ retention. Responses are presented in Table 4.16.
Findings in Table 4.16 show that 70 percent of the teachers indicated that household income level affect students’ retention to great extent as it was reported by one teacher that majority of the students were dependent on CDF bursaries and county bursaries in order for them to remain in school. Majority of the students’ (77.1%) also supports the finding from the teachers that household income influence students retention to a very great extent.

The teachers and students further explained that students from poor families are always sent home for school fees. Some parents are not able to clear school fees and the students end up dropping out of school. In addition, inability to adequately provide necessary school needs such as proper uniform, sanitary towels force some students especially girls to drop out of school. They involve themselves in labor activities to buy personal belongings. The finding was supported by a principal who said that, “some parents are low income earners and their main income is from farming and manual jobs. The income is not adequate to cater for every education needs for all their children. Some children especially the elder ones drop out of school to substitute the family income.” This implies that some parents earn little income and
are not able to retain their children in school. The finding is in agreement with Daudi (2016) who revealed that extreme poverty in families make them unable to maintain their children in school and they are always sent home due to lack of school fees.

The study also sought to find out the types of family that majority of the students come from. Table 4.17 presents the findings.

**Table 4.17: Type of family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle –income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-income</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 4.17 show that 83.3 percent of the teachers and 81.0 percent of students indicated that the students came from low income families. The finding was supported by the principal who said that, “the main financiers of the students’ are the parents who are low income earners and are unable to pay fees on time leading to the students being sent out of school resulting to low retention rates.” The finding shows that majority of the students in the study area come from poor families who lack the ability to fully finance their children education. The finding concurs with Abdullahi (2005) who argued that poor families are unable to pay school fees for all their children and these children dropout of school. The teachers were asked to tick on the level of agreement on listed statements related to influence of household income level on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.18
Table 4.18: Teachers’ perceptions on influence of household income

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>UD</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from poor families drop out of school.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often drop out of school for wage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial status of household’s influence students’ dropout</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60

Findings in Table 4.18 show that 90 percent of the teachers agreed that student’s financial status of households influence students’ dropout. It was supported by the principals who said that the household income influences the retention of students. This shows household income determines whether a student will remain in school till completion or not. The finding is in agreement with Dachi and Garrett (2013) study which established that the main barrier to sending children to school was financial strain and parents’ inability to pay fees.

The students were also asked to tick on the level of agreement on listed statements related to influence of household income level on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19: Students’ perceptions on influence of household income on retention rates

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from poor families drop out of school.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often drop out of school for wage labour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial status of households influence students’ dropout</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=105

Findings in Table 4.19 show that 94.3 percent agreed that the financial status of households’ influence students’ dropout. This implies that students from poor background are likely to drop out of school. This was supported by an interview with a principal who said that the students who had dropped out were from low income parents who could not afford to pay for the school fees. The study is consistent with Stasavage (2005) study which established that parents who cannot afford school needs retain their children at home thus affecting retention in school.

4.6 Influence of Parents Education Level on Students Retention rate

The third research objective was to assess how the education level of parent influence students’ retention in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The study sought to find out the parents’ education level. Students were therefore asked to indicate their parents’ highest education level. Figure 4.1 presents the findings.
Findings in figure 4.1 show that 66.7 percent (70) of the parents had attained secondary education. During an interview one principal in support of the finding said that, “majority of the parents in my school are not highly educated they have only attained primary and secondary education. These parents gets information from their students and sometimes don’t act on them making the students morale for learning to be low. Only a few professionals who have achieved higher education. Professional parents are in a better position to encourage their children to choose a good career path as compared to unprofessional parents. Career parents also encourage their children to focus on their studies till completion.”

This shows that majority of the parents had only attained basic primary and secondary education and only a few had attained higher education to enable them build professional careers. Educated parents also motivate their children to concentrate in the studies and always aim at achieving the best results. This finding concurs with
World Bank Report (2011) that literate persons are more likely to enroll and retain their children in schools than illiterate parents.

The researcher further sought the students’ and teacher’s opinion on whether the parent’s level of education have influence on student's retention in school. Table 4.20 presents the findings.

**Table 4.20: Responses on influence of parent’s education level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.20 show that 70 percent of the teachers and 74.3 percent of students opined that parent's level of education have influence on student's retention in school. The findings were supported by the principals who said that:

Educated parents know the value of education and they encourage their children to scale higher in education. Students from educated family tend to have high academic achievements and bright career prospects. On the other hand, illiterate parents are not supportive of girl child education rather they invest in educating the boys. Students whose parents are professionals have higher academic goals and are more likely to finish secondary school and aspire to achieve higher education as compared to students whose parents are not educated and do not know the value of education. Educated parents are also very concerned with their children academic life and they show their
children the importance of education. Such students are highly motivated to learn and stay in school till completion.

The finding shows that that parental level of education influences students’ retention rate. The finding supports Onyango (2010) who asserted that educated parents appreciate the value of education more than illiterate ones and normally assist their children to progress in education both morally and materially.

The teachers were asked to tick on the degree of agreement on listed statements on influence of parents’ education level on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.21.

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree
Table 4.21: Influence of parents’ education level on student’s retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents do not make a successful transition to higher institutions of learning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents are unable to cope with the academic demands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic attainment of parents significantly reduce chances of school dropouts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their children</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents know the private and social benefits of investing in education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60

Results in Table 4.21 show that 91.7 percent agreed that educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their children and the parents knew the benefits of education. This was supported by the interviewed principals who said that students whose parents are well educated remain in school since there is close
monitoring of the student by the parent hence, they are retained in school. The students had role models in their homes hence being maintained in school.

This shows that high academic attainment of a mother and father significantly reduce chances of secondary school dropout for both girls and boys in schools hence increase in retention rates in public secondary schools. The finding is in agreement with De Graaf and Ganzeboom (2010) study which established that learners with highly educated parents proceed to higher secondary education which is higher number compared to learners with middle or low-educated parents.

Students were asked to tick on the degree of agreement on listed statements of parents’ education level on influence of students’ retention.

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree
Table 4.22: Students’ agreement level on influence of parents’ education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents do not make a successful transition to</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher institutions of learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents are unable to cope with the academic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic attainment of parents significantly reduce chances of school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their children</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents know the private and social benefits of investing in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=105

From the findings in table 4.22 it was found out that, 88.6 percent agreed that educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic work. This was also supported by a teacher who reported that students from educated parents had follow up in their students’ academic progress and maintenance of discipline making them remain in
school. The principals also agreed that the students whose parents were educated would check the students homework and ensure that it is completed making the students to remain in school. One principal confirmed that in his school most of the students who were on punishment due to failure to do homework had come from uneducated parents.

4.7 Influence of Parental Involvement in Academic on Students Retention

The fourth research objective was to find out how parental involvement in students’ academic activities influence students’ retention in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The teachers and students were asked their opinion on whether the school administration involve parents in students’ academic activities. Findings are presented in Table 4.23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.23 show that all students and teacher’s 100 percent opined that the school administration involve parents in students’ academic activities. The principals concurred with the students. One principal said that, “parents are actively involved in the students’ academic activities through academic clinics, parent’s annual general meetings and inviting parents to discuss students discipline matters where parents engage with the teachers in knowing their children better and the teachers get clarification on student issues during the meetings. When a student is unwell a parent is telephoned to come to school and collect the student to take them to hospital and
this help in the management of the students’ discipline.” This implies that the school administration involves parents in the academic activities which gives a room for open discussion between teachers, students and parents. Student’s weaknesses are identified and they are guided on how to overcome them which might contribute to a reduction in drop outs. This finding is in agreement with Snow, Barnes and Chandler (2013) that that the single variable most positively connected to all literacy skills was formal involvement in parent-school activities such as PTA participation, attending school activities and serving as a volunteer.

The teachers were asked to give an opinion on whether students whose parents are actively involved in their learning activities are less likely to drop out as compared to students whose parents are not involved. Table 4.24 presents the findings.

Table 4.24: Teacher responses on parental involvement in students’ academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 4.24 show that 70 percent of the teachers felt that students whose parents are actively involved in their learning activities are less likely to drop out as compared to students whose parents are not involved. The finding was supported by the principal who said that:

Students whose parents are actively involved in academics are less likely to drop out of school because their parents always track their performance and encourage them to work hard. Parental support is very important in the
academics the students feel loved and cared for and they work hard so as not to disappoint their parents if they fail to meet their expectations.

This implies that parental involvement in students’ academic activities is a great factor influencing students’ retention. This finding concurs with Onyango (2012) that the approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement.

Students were asked the extent to which parents’ involvement in their children academic activities influence retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.25.

**Table 4.25: Extent of parental involvement in academics influence retention rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 4.25 show that 80 percent of the students opined that parents’ involvement in their children academic activities influence retention. This finding supports the teachers and principals’ sentiments that involving parents in students’ academic activities influence students’ retention. From a document analysis in one school showed that a student who had 286 marks in KCPE was taken to stay with the grandparents and the parents had not come to school was getting D minus The finding is in agreement with Donkor (2010) that positive parental value of education influences the future economic well-being of learners which is highly influenced by achievement of higher education.
The teachers were asked to tick on the degree of agreement on listed statements on influence of parents’ education level on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.26.

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree.

Table 4.26: Teachers’ perceptions on influence of parents’ education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students whose parents are involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parental value of education influences students’ retention rates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of parents in activities such as PTA and school academic day is related to retention</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental guidance and motivation encourage students to remain in school</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60

Findings in Table 4.26 show that 91.7 percent of the teachers agreed that parental guidance and motivation encourages students to remain in school. This was
supported by the principals who said that parents education level affected students retention as those who were dropping out their parents had only completed primary level while others had dropped out in primary school. This finding is in agreement with Lezotte (2001) that children whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision making and are generally more involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school.

The researcher further sought student’s perceptions on listed statements on influence of parents’ education level on students’ retention. Findings are presented in Table 4.27.

Key: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, UD-Undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27: Students perceptions influence of parents’ education level
Students whose parents are involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive parental value of education influences students’ retention rates</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>68.6</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>16.2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7.6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4.7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of parents in activities such as PTA and school academic day is related to retention</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental guidance and motivation encourage students to remain in school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=105

Findings in Table 4.27 indicate that 90.4 percent of the students agreed that parental guidance and motivation encourages students to remain in school. This implies that active parental involvement in academic activities influences students’ retention in secondary schools. During an interview with one of the principals said that the students whose parents were involved their academic affairs were likely to remain in school until completion. It was also reported that the students who had good entry behavior in form one and their parents were not concerned with their academic work were dropping. The finding is also consistent with Donkor (2010) that positive parental value of education influences the future economic well-being of learners which is highly influenced by achievement of higher education.
4.8 Inferential Statistics

In trying to portray the relationship between the study variables and their findings the researcher utilized the Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation (r). Correlation coefficient (r) ranging from 0.10 to 0.29 illustrates weak correlation, 0.30 to 0.49 is considered medium and whereas 0.50 to 1.0 is considered strong (Wong & Hiew, 2005). A correlation test was run in SPSS to identify possible association between socio economic factors and students’ retention.

Findings in appendix V show that three variables were significant at 0.05 level of significance and p < 0.01 two tailed test. The Pearson correlation coefficient for education costs and students’ retention was (r = 0.716, p-value=0.000) which was significant, that of house hold income and students’ retention was (r= 0.662, p-value=0.000) which was also significant and that of parents’ involvement in academic activities and students’ retention was (r= 0.590, p-value=0.003) which was also significant. Correlation between parents’ education level and students’ retention was insignificant (r= 0.105, p-value=0.514).

Based on appendix V the correlation between education costs and students’ retention was the strongest depicted by a correlation value of (r = 0.716, p-value=0.000). Followed by the relationship between house hold income (r= 0.662, p-value=0.000). Then followed by parents’ involvement in academic activities (r= 0.590, p-value=0.003) and the weakest correlation being parents’ education level (r= 0.105, p-value=0.514).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on the summary of the major findings and conclusions. It also suggests recommendations for potential actions and suggestions for future research.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The purpose was to investigate the socio-economic factors influencing students’ retention rates in secondary schools in Matinyani Sub-County, Kitui County. The study was guided by the following research objectives; to determine the influence of cost of education on students’ retention in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county; to examine how household incomes levels influence students’ retention rates in secondary schools Matinyani sub-county; to assess how the education level of parent influences the retention of students in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county and to find out how parental involvement in students’ academic activities influence students retention in secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. The study was guided by Human Capital Theory.

The study adopted descriptive survey research design. Target population comprised of 5 principals, 72 teachers and 600 form four students from public secondary schools in Matinyani sub-county. Simple random sampling techniques was applied to sample 120 form four students, 5 principals and 72 teachers. Data was collected using questionnaires, interview guides and document analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analysis and data was presented in tables and figures.
In determination on the influence of cost of education on student’s retention, findings established that education costs influence student retention to a very great extent as indicated by 74.3% of the students. Findings also established that there were some students who failed to return to school after being sent home to collect money to settle school costs. The main education costs included school development fees, club fees, examination fees, remedial teaching, uniform fees and activity fees. The findings also established that school fees is a major obstacle to students retention in secondary education, school levies are significant reason for dropout and auxiliary costs are the greatest obstacle to retention. This finding is in agreement with Obua (2011) auxiliary costs like PTA levies affects greatly students’ retention rates in secondary schools in Kenya.

In line with the second objective which examined how household income influence retention of students, findings reveal that household income level influence students’ retention to a very great extent as indicated by 72.7% of the teachers and students. Majority of the parents in the sampled public secondary schools were low income earners and were therefore unable to pay fees on time and school could no longer retain their children in school. The available finances provided by parents were inadequate leading to drop out as students left school to look for menial jobs in order to supplement the family income. Findings also established that students from poor families drop out of school more than children who are from better-off families. This finding support Dachi and Garrett (2013) study which established that the main
barrier to sending children to school was financial strain and parents’ inability to pay fees.

The third research objective was on influence of parents’ education level on influence students’ retention. Findings established that parents’ education level have influence on student's retention in school as indicated by 66.7% of the teachers and students. The study revealed that majority of the parents in my school are not highly educated and they have only attained primary and secondary education, students from uneducated parents are unable to cope with the academic demands due to lack of guidance on academics, high academic attainment of parents significantly reduce chances of school dropouts, educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic work, educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their children and educated parents know the private and social benefits of investing in education.

In addition, children from well-educated parents have better chances of pursuing their siblings or parents’ professionals but those brought up by illiterate parents lack immediate role models to mirror and might give up on education and drop out of school. This finding is in agreement with Onyango (2010) asserted that educated parents appreciate the value of education more than illiterate ones and normally assist their children to progress in education both morally and materially.

In line with the fourth research objective, the study establishes that parents’ involvement in their children academic activities influence retention to a very great
extent as indicated by 80% of the students. Findings also established that parents are actively involved in the students’ academic activities through academic clinics, parent’s annual general meetings and inviting parents to discuss students discipline matters.

The study revealed that students whose parents are involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school, positive parental value of education influences students’ retention rates, approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement and parental guidance and motivation encourages students to remain in school. This finding concurs with Lezotte (2001) that children whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision making and are generally more involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school.

5.3 Conclusion

From the research it was concluded that:

- Education costs influence retention rates. The researcher concludes that the cost of secondary education was very high as parents were required to meet some operational costs like school development fees, club fees, examination fees, remedial teaching, uniform fees and activity fees.

- Most students drop out of school because of their parents’ poor financial status. The parents who earn very little money are unable to pay school fees on time. This results to the school administration sending the students home to collect school fees and not all students who are sent
home manage to come back to school. When the parents lack funds to maintain their children in school, they eventually drop out. Girls have more needs as compared to boys and lack of money for academic and personal needs force them to drop out of school to look for manual jobs while other get married.

- Parental level of education influence students’ retention rates. It has also shown that high academic attainment of parents reduces chances of secondary school dropout. The researcher further concludes educated parents were more effective in helping their children in academic work and that educated parents were interested in the academic progress of their children.

- Parents are involved in students’ academic activities. The school administration organizes academic clinics and parents day to discuss the academic performance of students. This might encourage retention since students feel free to discuss some of the challenges that they face in learning and through collaboration of the teachers and their parents, they are able to overcome them and concentrate more on their academic achievements. The students whose parents are involved in the academic activities of their children were more likely to concentrate in the academic achievements.
5.4 Recommendations

From the research findings the following recommendations were made:

i. The Government needs to sensitize parents especially in rural areas to fully understand and appreciate the importance of completion of secondary education.

ii. School management committee need to establish an integrated programme to encourage parents/guardians to closely monitor the performance of their children in schools and educate them fairly without discrimination.

iii. The principals need to organize academic clinics in the schools more often and create a platform where individual subject teachers meet with students and their parents and have thorough discussion with respect to students’ performance in every subject.

iv. Communities need to be empowered to start off income generating activities to alleviate poverty and enable families increase their income and have the ability to retain their children in secondary school till completion.
5.5. Suggestions for Further Study

The researcher suggests listed areas for further study.

i. A related study focusing on another sub-county or whole county could be carried out to determine if the circumstances in Matinyani Sub-County apply to other counties in Kenya.

ii. A similar study should be undertaken in public primary schools in the sub-County in order to compare results.

iii. A replica of the study should be carried out incorporating more variables that possibly influence students’ retention. These variables could include institutional factors as well as cultural factors.

iv. A study of how school administration roles influence students’ retention in public secondary schools can be carried out.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Introduction Letter

Letter to Principals,

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi currently carrying out a research on “socio-economic factors influencing students’ retention rates at secondary school level in Matinyani Sub County, Kitui County, Kenya”. I am therefore humbly requesting for your permission to gather the required information from the students and teachers in your institution. The questionnaires will be specifically meant for this study and therefore no name of the respondents will be required. The responses are strictly meant for academic purposes only. The teachers and students’ identity will be treated with confidentiality. Your assistance and support on this matter will be highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance

Yours Faithfully,

Jedidah Makau,

University of Nairobi

P.O. Box 30197-00100

Nairobi – Kenya
Appendix II: Interview Guide for the Principals

1. What is your highest level of education?
2. How long have worked as a principal in this school?
3. How can you describe the retention rate in this school in the last four years?
4. What the main education costs in this school?
5. Does the cost of education influence students’ retention?
6. How can you describe the economic status of parents in your school?
7. How does the household income level influence students’ retention rates?
8. How can you rate the parents of this school education level?
9. Does the parental education level influence students’ retention rates?
10. Are the parents actively involved in the students’ academic activities?
11. How does parental involvement influence students’ retention rates?
Appendix III: Questionnaire for Teachers

Answer all the questions by ticking (✓) your preferred choice or fill the blank space. You do not have to write your name as your identity will remain confidential. Please be free to give your opinion in the responses.

Section A: Demographic Information

1. Gender.
   Male ( )       Female ( )

2. What is your academic qualification?
   Masters in Education [ ]       Bachelors degree in Education [ ]
   Diploma in Education [ ]       Others (specify)

3. How many years have you been a teacher?
   Below 5 years ( )       6-10 years ( )       11-15 years ( )
   16-20 years ( )       More than 20 years ( )

Section B: Influence of cost of education

4. To what extent do education costs influence retention of secondary schools students?
   Very great extent [ ]       Great extent [ ]
   Medium extent [ ]       Little extent [ ]

5. Kindly list the school costs that affect students’ retention in secondary schools.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

69
6. Kindly indicate your level of agreement on the listed statements related to influence of cost of education.

1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School fees is a major obstacle to students retention in secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are often sent home to collect school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School levies are significant reason for dropout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary costs are the greatest obstacle to retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Influence of Household Income Level

7. To what extent does household income level affect students’ retention?

Very great extent [ ]     Great extent [ ]
Moderate extent [ ]       Little extent [ ]   No extent [ ]

Please explain how household income affect students’ retention

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

8. From what types of family do majority of your students come from?

High-income [ ]     Middle-income [ ]     Lower-income [ ]
9. Kindly indicate your level of agreement on the listed statements related to influence of household income level.

1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from poor families drop out of school more than children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who are from better-off families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often drop out of school for wage labour in order to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplement the family income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial status of households influence students' dropout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section D: Influence of Parents education level**

10. In your opinion, does the parent's level of education have influence on student's retention in school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. Kindly indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on the parental level of education on retention rates.

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents do not make a successful transition to higher institutions of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents are unable to cope with the academic demands due to lack of guidance on academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic attainment of parents significantly reduce chances of school dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents know the private and social benefits of investing in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section E: Influence of Parental involvement on retention**

12. Does the school administration involve parents in students’ academic activities?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. In your opinion do you think that students whose parents are actively involved in their learning activities are less likely to drop out as compared to students whose parents are not involved?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Kindly explain your answer

_____________________________________________________________________

___
14. Kindly indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on the parental involvement on retention rates

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students whose parents are involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parental value of education influences students’ retention rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of parents in activities such as PTA and school academic day is related to retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental guidance and motivation encourages students to remain in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix IV: Questionnaire for Students

Answer all the questions by ticking (✓) your preferred choice or fill the blank space. You do not have to write your name as your identity will remain confidential. Please be free to give your opinion in the responses.

Section A: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?

Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Which is your age bracket?

15-17 years ( ) 17-20 years ( ) more than 20 years ( )

Section B: Influence of cost of education

3. In the years that you have been in this school, has any of your colleagues failed to return to school after being sent home to collect school fees?

Yes ( ) No ( )

4. To what extent does each of the listed education costs influence student retention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubs registration fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial tuition fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Influence of Household Income Level on retention

5. To what extent does family income level affect students’ retention?

Very great extent [ ]

Great extent [ ] moderate extent [ ]

Little extent [ ]

no extent [ ]

Please explain how household income affect students’ retention

6. How can you describe your family income level?

High-income [ ]

Middle-income [ ]

Lower-income [ ]

7. Kindly indicate your level of agreement on the listed statements related to influence of household income level.

1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students from poor families drop out of school more than students who are from better-off families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students often drop out of school for wage labour in order to supplement the family income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial status of households influence students ‘ dropout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Influence of Parents education level

8. What is your parents’ education level?

Primary [ ]

Secondary [ ]

College [ ]

University [ ]

Never attended school [ ]
9. In your opinion, does the parent's level of education influence on student's retention rates? Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. Kindly indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on the parental level of education on retention rates.

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from uneducated parents do not make a successful transition to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher institution of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from uneducated parents are unable to cope with the academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demands due to lack of guidance on academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High academic attainment of parents significantly reduce chances of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are more effective in helping their children in academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents are concerned with the academic progress of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated parents know the private and social benefits of investing in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section E: Influence of Parental involvement on retention**

11. Is your parent actively involved in your academic activities?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
12. To what extent does parent involvement in their children academic activities influence retention?

Very great extent [ ] Great extent [ ]
Medium extent [ ] Little extent [ ]

13. Kindly indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on the parental level of education on retention rates.

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students whose parents are involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parental value of education influences students’ retention rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches of parents towards the school have a positive effect in learners’ academic achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of parents in activities such as PTA and school academic day is related to retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental guidance and motivation encourages students to remain in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
### Appendix V: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students retention</th>
<th>Education costs</th>
<th>Household income</th>
<th>Parents education level</th>
<th>Parents involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students retention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education costs</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.662**</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents education level</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.590**</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
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