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ABSTRACT

Although the government is providing direct grants to public primary schools through the FPE financing scheme, wastage of education in form of dropout and repetition have continued to be perverse. The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors influencing wastage of pupils in public primary schools in Igembe South Division, Meru County. The objectives of the study were to establish the influence of family income, cost of education, family education and early marriage on wastage. The study also sought to establish measures that could be put in place to reduce wastage. The researcher was guided by Theory of Demand all along. The study adopted descriptive survey design to collect the data from all the respondents. Head teachers were purposively sampled while Mulusa’s (1988) table of determining sample size was used to select sample sizes of pupils and teachers. Questionnaires were used to collect data which were analyzed and interpreted using frequencies, percentages and other descriptive statistics. The research established that public primary school perpetually experienced wastage, which lowered the full utilization of the available skilled manpower leaving resources. The family income as evidenced by families low income was unable to purchase education materials and meet the other children’s requirements and the cost of education that was above the reach of the many made the learners to either drop or repeat. The families with low level of family education did not assist their children progress in school, thus lowering the class attendance, early teenage pregnancies, initiations and early age of marriages affected education in form of wastage. Other factors that influenced wastage included students’ individual problems, policies, inadequate financing and unreliable revenue income generating activities. The strategies to mitigate the wastage problems were that parents should be engaged in more economic activities, MoEST and NGOs to stress and sensitize to parents the importance of education to discourage wastage through early marriages and low education levels. The government should increase allocation of funds to FPE to lower education cost to make it more affordable. This will reduce wastage through repetition and drop out. The study suggested that similar study be carried out in other counties for comparison purposes.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Education is an essential tool for human life that helps pupils to optimize their potentials (Baller, 2009). People with good education are looked upon by the society for socioeconomic development. That is why the United General Assembly adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human right, under article 26 right, that everyone has the right to education hence children have the right to education. The law on the children right to free and compulsory education puts the responsibility to ensure that the enrolment, attendance and completion of the basic education of the children aged between six and fourteen years on the government. In most developed countries it’s the responsibility of the parents to send their children to school (World Bank, 2009). The Regional Meetings of Asian member states of UNESCO held in Karachi planned to provide education in all Asian countries. The Amman Mid Decade Review for All (1996) reaffirmed their commitment of Jomtiem resolutions. The Conference on Education for All (E.F.A) held in Jomtiem, pledged for renewed commitment to provide EFA by 2000. The Dakar Conference (UNCDF, 2006) reviewed developments in achieving UPE in Africa. The MDGs set target to ensure that all children complete a full primary schooling course by 2015.
The World Bank development report of 1999 shows the level that the education plays in securing a country’s ability to assess, adapt and apply new technology for economic growth. Orodho (1997) report that education would lead to acquisition of technical skills and attitudes with increased economic productivity for a country to keep pace with technical advancement especially information technology and new production methods that needed well trained and intellectual labour force. Education spreads and applies knowledge leading to the development of dynamic globally competitive economies (World Bank, 2009). In the above regards it can be noted that investment in primary education has benefited individual, society and the world. It has been established that education is most powerful instrument that reduces poverty by increasing the value of the labour force.

The governments of different nations have strived to adequately provide adequate finance to their respective education system at varying degrees. They have been participating by subsidizing education to make it more affordable through other partners, households and donor agencies. Financing of education has varied in proportion of public and private funding expenditure. In many countries it has fairly taken a small proportion of the total government expenditure while in some other countries this proportion has been falling due to competition from other sectors that require government attention. In countries like Korea, U.S and India governments’ expenditure on basic education has been higher than any other level
of education (Mutiah, 2007). World Bank (2006), noted that finance for education’s projects have risen from 300 million in 1990s to nearly 600 million in 2010 with Africa’s education receiving much of the expansion to primary sector.

Despite these large budgetary allocations to education the world was not on course to achieve its UPE target by 2015 due to educational wastage, thus EFA (2008) decried the low global participation rates in education. EFA (2008) advanced that primary education suffered from high level of global inequalities in education. Thus wastage inform of repetition and dropouts had remained a global problem (Blang, 1987; Psacharopolous, 1985). Hence, even the best equipped schools in the developed countries could not keep students from dropping out where economic hardships or poverty were on the course (UNESCO, 2008). Juneja (1997) found that about 83 million children enrolled in India but about half withdrew before reaching the middle upper class. Ngau (1991) found that data from Latin America and Africa showed that more than 50% of the students who began school dropped before the cycle ended. The Sub-Saharan African had over a quarter of its’ children of school going age out of school in 2000. Nakanyike (2003) decried the high dropout rate in primary schools in Uganda because the percentage of primary One Cohort Reaching Primary Five (1977-2001) were 100 and 39 percent respectively.

The family income is the most powerful influence on demand for primary education. The primary school retention, grade retention or withdrawal in most
LDCs might be determined by the level of family income (Psacharopolous, 1985). Alkens and Barbarin (2008) suggested that family resources helped create positive literacy environment although some parents were unable to afford. The parental level of education also influenced the level of pupil’s educational attainment. Thus pupils with families whose parents had less education tended to systematically perform worse than pupils whose parents had more education. Nannyaonjo (2007) found that parents with low level of education were less likely to be involved with the school activities and advocate effectively for their children’s education, making them at risk to repetition. Religious and socio-cultural traditions such as early age of marriage especially in North Africa and Middle East explained the low participation rates in education.

Aruntalilake (2004) showed that despite Sri Lankans’ government subsidizing education, significant educational costs disadvantaged children from poor families. Studies in Sub-Saharan Africa revealed that majority of the parents whose children had dropped out of school cited lack of money to pay school levies. Further Al-Samarra, Colclough, Rose and Tembon (2003) also identified opportunity cost as factors lowering access to primary education globally. In many LDCs the opportunity costs of students’ time were acknowledged as factors influencing attendances or withdrawal, thus Mbilinyi (1987) decried the low enrolment of children in Tanzania. Kenya like other LDCs has witnessed high wastage in education as was revealed by data analysis that about 10% of the
pupils in each class failed to reach the next grade. Thus pupils and parents alike would consider opportunity cost of being in school that would affect pupils in form of provision of labour to supplement family income. Abagi (2007) found that 856.7 thousand pupils enrolled in grade one in Kenya but about 737.1 (13.84%) thousand enrolled in grade 4, four years later. In addition the national dropout rate in 2007 was 3.5% (MOE, 2008). According to the data obtained from the MOE (2008) the dropout rates in primary school by the province were estimated. The North Eastern province had the highest dropout rate of 4.7%, followed by Rift Valley 3.6%, Nyanza 3.5%, Central 1.9%, Eastern 1.8% and Western 1.6% (MoEST, 2009).

The grade repetition was found to be common among the students from low socioeconomic background. In some schools, pupils were forced to repeat upper classes several times or sit for K.C.P.E many times to obtain higher scores and proceed to the best secondary schools (MOE, 2006; Isaac, 2011). The 2004 to 2006 data showed that the average repetition rate of 6.1% was high in Kenya (MOEST, 2007). Districts in ASAL had however been hit by low completion rates with North Eastern Province recording 36.5% rate against Nairobi 55.4% (MoEST, 2008). The Sessional Paper No.1 2005(2004) attributed wastage in education to high cost of education, school uniforms, development levies and private tuition. Njuguna (2007) in his research reported that 16.6 million lived on less than one dollar (Ksh.70) per day, this increased school dropout due to
poverty. School fees and high opportunity cost of attending school from low income groups excluded many household (Onsonu, 2006). Mutia (2008) attributed high dropout and absenteeism to lack of school fees. Absenteeism is associated with the failure of students to pay fees hence were sent home frequently to collect school levies.

In Kenya the parental level of education has direct bearing on student continuing of school (Musau, 2007). In addition, parental occupation determined the level of education the child was likely to attain as the occupation of some of the parent could not provide a consistent income hence the family income could be low. Further traditions had impacted negatively on education and enrolment that had considered girls as mothers or wives (Michubu, 2005), thus girls were married off by her parents to achieve social status in the community. Many communities believed that girls become more assertive and promiscuous through education, therefore their access to education was not prioritized and may be withdrawn from school to get married. Initiation affected pupils’ school attendance as they remained at home waiting to meet communities’ obligation.

According to Eshiwani (1993) dropouts had several implications for all education systems. According to Chiuri and Akiumi (2005) a system was said to exhibit internal inefficiency if the rate of progression from any grade to the final grade was low. The dropout rate in Meru County was on the increase with Nyambene North District increasing from 2.0% in 2003 to 12.5% against her neighbor Meru.
central that decreased from 5.7% in 2003 to 3.9% in 2007 (Emis, 2009). This district had also been hit by low completion rates of 61.5% up from 48.9% in 2003 against Meru South 100.7% (Emis, 2009). These statistical data gave information about the low internal efficiency of Nyambene North district where Igembe South District was curved from Nyambene areas of Igembe and Ntonyiri produced over 80% of Miraa consumed in Kenya (Kimathi, 2010). However proceeds from these farms were not able to sustain many household with neither basic human needs nor adequate finances that could retain their children in school. The direct cost of education and opportunity cost was found to exclude many from attending school in Igembe South District (Igembe South District Environmental Report (2005), because education costs were found to be unaffordable by many households.

Githinji (2010) decried the high rate of pupils dropping out of school to work out in Miraa farms in Igembe. Many parents with low level of education engaged their children in their farms during school days making them miss more school days, this made them more at risk for repetition. The high rate of dropout of the school girls being forced into early marriages in Igembe has been worrying as more girls than boys’ dropped out to get married. Initiation schedules were carried out in school playgrounds and when classes were on. This created conflict between the community and the school calendars.
The new initiates withdrew immediately or later because initiates felt that they were ready to meet the traditional obligations and intense pressure was mounted on them by their community to withdraw from school and marry. In spite of the government employing ways to end wastage menace it has not been able to fully address this scourge. The researcher however, has expressed much concern that the many decisions that have been made were based on arbitrary observations or beliefs rather than on justified criteria, that is through research. Hence it would be prudent to unravel the mystery of educational wastage in Igembe South District through this research study.

1.2 The statement of the problem

Education is considered a basic need and a right to every child, however the development of education especially primary education in Kenya is faced with many challenges. The low family income has made it impossible for parents to provide their children with home and school requirements. This has made pupils to remain at home to provide labour in order to augment their income and buy the school requirements.

Budgetary constraints have also led to the government into passing on the rising educational costs to households and the community in general to contribute salaries for teachers not on payroll and other general development in the school. Hence the inability of individual households and the community in general to
adequately meet the escalating cost of primary education has created a lot of concern. According to the data obtained from MOES (2008) Maua office, 2959 were enrolled in grade 5 about 1302 (44%) were enrolled in grade 8 four years later. The ignorance among parents, social cultural factors such as initiation ceremonies are prevalent in this district. This is evidence by Githinji (2010) of Star newspaper who quoted Dr. Mary Mwiandi of the University of Nairobi while in Akachiw in Igembe South decried the high rate of pupils dropping of school to work in farms.

The combination of the above has been cited by various groups as being responsible for the inconsistence of cohorts entering each year in different classes. This is an indication of dropout and repetition in classes of students from one class to another. From the above it is clear that wastage of pupils in the form of repetition and drop out poses a grave concern. It is in the light of the above that this study was designed to establish how they influence wastage rates in the District.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the socioeconomic factors that influence wastage in public primary schools in Igembe East Division of Igembe South District.

1.4 Objectives of the study

This study was guided by the following objectives:
1.5 Research questions

i. To what extent did the family’s level of income contribute to wastage?

ii. What was the level of educational costs on wastage?

iii. To what extent did family level of education influence wastage?

iv. To what extent did early marriages influence wastage?

1.6 Significance of the study

The finding of study provided information on wastage phenomenon since the seriousness and the magnitude of the problems was highlighted. The study would benefit learners when causes of wastage and their anticipated role in curbing down wastage rate are made more explicit. The learners may also develop interest in education. The teachers would be more knowledgeable when dealing with issues relating to wastage of pupils having known the causes and effects.

The study also provided information on communities’ contribution to wastage and their roles to curbing down wastage was also spelt out. Parents could use this information to identify community based factors that influenced wastage thus increasing retention of pupils. Additionally the findings of the study were useful
to the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) as they offered insights of the underlying determinants of wastage phenomena. Policy makers may use this information when formulating policies that were meant to avert educational wastage. The MOEST could use media and resources at their disposals to sensitize managers of education on the need for increased retention and reduced wastage rate in public primary schools in Kenya.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The findings of the study were limited to Igembe South District out of the 9 districts of the Meru County geographically and might therefore not be the true reflection of other regions in the country since the causes of wastage of pupils differed depending on the regions. The researcher assured the respondents that the study would be used for academic purposes only.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

The study focused on the effects of socioeconomic factors on wastage of pupils in public primary schools in Igembe South District. There were other factors that were attributed to educational wastage but for the sake of this study the researcher only considered family income, educational cost, parent’s level of education and the influence of early marriages on wastage in sampled primary schools.
1.9 Basic assumptions of the study

1. The study assumed that the data and the records were available and up to date.
2. The respondents provided reliable and honest responses.

1.10 Operational definitions of significant terms.

Cohort refers to a group of pupils who undergo the same education experience.

Completion rate refers to the number of students successfully completing or graduating from primary school in a given year expressed as a percentage of totals of children of official graduation age of population.

Cost This refers to educational costs that are charged or channeled directly in school in monetary terms.

Cycle refers to a period in which pupils begin and complete primary level of education.

Direct costs refers to costs incurred by an individual or community to acquire formal, in primary school this includes cost of tuition, cost of scholastic, materials development levies and any other fees that education institutions may charge

Dropout refers to is a voluntary type of enrollment loss in education cycle.
Enrollment loss refers to students who leave school before the end of primary education.

Enrollment refers to the registered number of pupils in the grades in a given year of primary education.

Grade Retention refers to act of a pupil spending or remaining in the same grade for one or more years before progressing to the next class.

Indirect costs – These are costs incurred by the government in provision of primary education. These will include teachers’ salaries and other funds channeled to school.

Primary education refers to the first level of education that equips pupils with basics of life as knowledge, skills, morals and values for co-existence.

Socio -economic refers to variables that are economical and social in nature namely income, education cost and social cultural respectively that affect student participation in primary schools.

Wastage refers to features in education systems that contribute poor cost-effectiveness characterized by repetition and dropout.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study was organized in five sections in the following order; Chapter focused on the background to the study, statement of the of problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of study, limitations and delimitations and
definitions of the significant terms as used in the study. Chapter two dealt with literature review of the study and gave a detailed account of factors influencing wastage in public primary schools. Chapter three covered the research methodology that described research design, target population, sampling techniques and sample size, instruments validity, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter 4 reported on the data obtained from the respondents and discussed the research findings. Lastly, Chapter five focused on summary, recommendations of the study and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter has dealt with literature review. It has five sections namely concept of wastage in education, global perspective, an overview of education in Kenya, income challenges, cost of education, parental level of education, early marriage, summary of the literature review, theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

2.2 The concept of wastage in education
Education wastage refers to features in an education system that contribute to poor cost effectiveness, characterized by repetition and dropout (Eshiwani, 1993). In education the main objective is the attainment of stable literacy through 8 years of schooling. If a child entering school withdrew before completing class 8 it is considered as wastage in education. Research by UNESCO (1994, 1998 and 2007) and Eshiwani (2003) reported that wastage in all grades was a serious problem in LDCs. Estimates of repetition rates in LDCs indicated that half or two thirds of all pupils repeated subsequent grades (Todaro, 1981; Psacharopolous, 1985; UNESCO, 2007). The low completion rates resulting from low retention rates has drawn interest to policy makers and academician (Poverty Status Report, 2005). This phenomenon of high wastage in education has continued to persist and remained a challenge to successful implementation of national policies.
Research findings on wastage have differed depending on geographic location of country (UNESCO, 2007).

2.3 The Global perspective on wastage rate in education

World Bank (1995) notes, “The importance and relevance of education is by the country’s ability to produce quality manpower relevant to the economy, so effective primary education is a rock-bottom necessity for development”. Primary education’s effect on development is largely on cognitive skills’ results namely literacy, numeracy and governance.

Despite its importance primary education has faced many challenges namely grade repetition, retention and dropout in LDCs that has made pupils withdraw from school before they acquired knowledge and skills (UNESCO, 2007). Hence wastage among developed and LDCs has been a universal phenomena thus school systems have been unable to retain large flow of new entrants or continuing student making the achievement of UPE and completion rates difficult.

China and India’s parents withdrew their children from school because of the cost of schooling that was too expensive for them (Bray, 2003). In China about 1% of the 108.6 million primary school pupils withdrew from school because of the unaffordable cost of education. Like other developing nations, Sub-Saharan Africa’s children hardly completed the entire education cycle because poverty levels of households made it impossible to pay those educational costs (UNESCO,
Furthermore economic benefits of schooling has offset opportunity cost of attending school in LDCs countries.

The research studies carried out in the LDCs show that the financial burden imposed on parents by schools were unaffordable because of low level of family income (Bjorkman, 2005). The low income levels of the parents have made them unable to continue keeping their children in primary schools. In addition the parent’s level of education significantly determined primary school wastage rate in rural and urban areas. Families with higher levels of education spent more time helping their children with academic problems and also interacted in school related or literacy nurturing activities by parents (Nannyonjo, 2007; Okumu, 2008). The absence of basic services like education and social services lowered cohort completion and survival rates. Their school survival in relation to income category, gender and ethnicity found disparities to be by socioeconomic.

Grade repetition was attributed to reduced supply of school places for new entrants in Guatemala especially where wastage was highest in grade one. In most DCs highest levels of dropout were associated with highest grade repetition due to different socioeconomic backgrounds (UNESCO, 2007). Cultural roots in the Middle East, North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa such as early marriage caused low participation (Tamba, 2012). Educational costs also contributed to lack of access and attendance as tuition fees could be expensive to poor households to support their children education, this led to 108.6 million primary school dropouts
in China (Pevely, 2005). High opportunity costs was further found to influence decision to attend school.

2.4 Overview of education in Kenya

The campaign for FPE in Kenya began in 1963 after independence that was to fight poverty ignorance and illiteracy in the country (Session Paper No.10 of 1965 GOK). Kenyan education sector has been subjected to more than ten reviews. The major reviews were; The Ominde Commission, Gachathi Report 1976, The 1981 Presidential working party, The 1998 Master Plan on Education and Training, Task Force, GOK (1964, 1976, 1981, 1978 and 1998). All these reviews indicated the GOK’s search for policy framework and laying of strategies that made education serve the nation and meet developmental needs, (Okwach and Jacquelyn, 1999).

The attempts to enhance education sector was a GOK commitment to internationally established framework and for development of education. Kenya is a signatory to the UN Human Rights Charter that was reiterated in 1990 when participants from 155 nations including Kenya re-affirmed education as a human right adopting the world declaration on EFA. The ruling party KANU had committed to FPE in its first decade in Kenya’s political independence. The 1971 Presidential Decree waved fees in geographically disadvantaged areas. In 1973 tuition fee was waved in all other areas from standard one to four and Fees of Ksh
60 was imposed to class five to seven throughout Kenya (GOK, 1974), financial and logistical implications of the policies became obstacles.

The Fourth National Development Plan (1979-1983) was released under new political leadership with Moi maintaining UPE as standing educational objectives. The plan brought forward UPE progress by stating government’s objectives to provide UPE for 7 years. The government also abolished all levies and provided milk to public primary school to attract mostly pupils in ASAL to attend school (Republic of Kenya 1979).

Due to economic decline and the introduction of cost sharing, many gains were lost. Enrollment and participation rates at primary declined between 1990 and 2000. Transition and completion rates stalled, gender and regional disparities widened whilst children with special needs were under- enrolled. It was against this background that NARCH government elected in 2002 pledged to introduce UPE in 2003 and launched FPE as a policy in 2003 (Own, 2004 and Muthwii, 2004). Despite those political commitments and impressive policies, the attainment of such desires has been face with the challenges below.
2.5 The influence of family income on wastage.

According to Akale (2007) parents’ income that was insufficient to sustain the academic and personal social life of students caused low class concentration. The poor families walked for long treks in search of water consequently being late or absent from school (Bugembe, 2005), therefore the child’s welfare determined his retention in school. Education imposed burden to low income countries like Philippine, Bangladesh and Sub-Saharan Africa where two thirds of those who enrolled in primary school withdrew before the end of the education cycle due to low income (Castle 1972; Todaro, 1981; Farrant, 1997; UNESCO, 2007). Wanjohi (2002) observed that poverty and economic hardships led to withdrawal of over 79 percent in Rongai. Poverty levels in ASAL were to blame for early withdrawals from school (Ssekamwa, 2001; Huka, 2011). Hunter and May (2003) attributes school disruption to poverty. Further family related factors such as family’s level of income lowers parents’ capacity to neither pay school fees nor afford scholastic materials for their children. Brunefruth (2006) and Cordosos (2007) observed that poverty was the prime reason for students’ premature withdrawal.

The rising costs and the high rate of population growth combined with low economic growth had adverse effects on spending in infrastructure, health and socioeconomic sectors (Muindi, 2010). The low income earners could not retain their children in schools due to low income emanating from poor economic
growth. Poor nutrition among the public primary schools affected a child ability to think logically and was also observed as a factor in determining a child’s retention or withdrawals (World Bank, 1988; UNESCO, 2007), for some families were unable to provide due to their low family income. Parents are the ultimate decision makers about schooling of their children (Lloyds and Blac, 1991). However, poverty lowered their capacity to pay school fees or meet other school needs. Students from these poor families risked for repetition because their home background left them less well prepared to succeed and were less likely to miss school days that increased the chances of the repetition.

Chechi and Salv(2010) found that in Ghana some negative correlations emerged with probability of enrollment and low income jobs. Michael, B. and Chytilova (2009) warned that periods of instability affected primary schooling age (7-14) years. They found out that the higher the exposure to Amin’s Era, the lower the educational level. Similar findings were found by other studies in Burundi, DR. Congo, Sudan and Turkey where there were greater negative change in sending their children to school again during periods of disorder because of unstable occupation (Michael, 2009). The opportunity cost affected household and pupils in form of cash or services. Where families were subjected to abject poverty, children withdrawal from school to provide paid labour to supplement family income otherwise a family suffered valuable subsistence output (Todaro and Smith, 2003).
2.6 The influence of educational costs on wastage

The study observed that educational cost was high as parents had to incur expenditure on direct cost that the poor families considered beyond their financial ability (Colclough, 2003). Tansel (1997) reported that direct costs deterred parents from sending their children to school again in Ghana. The pre-mature withdrawal of pupils from schools in Malawi cited lack of money to pay school fees (Kadzamira and Chibwana, 2000). Children from poor homes were more likely to drop out of school than children from wealthier homes as the richer households were more able to afford direct and indirect costs of schooling than the poor (Coclough, 2003; Hunt, 2008). Direct costs impacted on schooling as was revealed by the large number of children who re-enrolled in schools when costs were reduced. Thus costs of education interacted with poverty to bring wastage in education.

The government’s recurrent expenditure on teachers’ salaries was over 90% and the remaining 10% was allocated for school the equipment. The government has shifted the burden of erecting physical structures and topping up teachers’ salaries that were not on government pay roll to parents (Chiuri and Kiumi, 2005). Educational costs were a burden to the poor families who spent a greater share of household income in school after paying for basic needs (Beneviste, Thomas and Antic, 2007)). Further household poverty remained the strongest predictor of risk in wastage of pupils that as was revealed by the parental inability to afford
education costs (Hunt, 2008). EFA (2011) found that children from the poorest 20% of the household in Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia were more than twice likely to drop-out of school due to high educational costs. Therefore these high costs of education have made the pupils from poor households to respond by withdrawing from their schools.

According to UNESCO (1995) children of parents infected with AIDS enrolled and dropped out of the school due to lack of money to pay tuition fees. In Sub-Saharan Africa children orphaned with AIDS were affected by poverty that made them unable to pay high school fees to their primary schools (UNICEF, 2003). The school administration then exerted pressure to pupils who underwent frustration due to those school based levies that made them respond by allowing them to withdraw before completing the primary education.

2.7 The influence of family level of education on wastage.

It was widely acknowledged that better educated parents were able to assist their children progress in education, both materially and morally (Holmes, 2003; Wamahiu, 2005). Further Appleton (1995) found that parental education enhanced parents’ contribution towards their child’s progress in school. Homes that provided stimulating environment like scholastic materials motivated pupils’ participation in education. Nkinyangi (1980) pointed out that the quantity and quality of education attained by the child was closely associated with parents’
educational attainment levels. The educated families motivated their children to be in school but those from uneducated spent much of their time working at home thus risking grade repetition.

According to Nannyonjo (2007) pupils whose parents finished primary and secondary had the ability to support their children’s education and the likely interactions of literate parents with their children in school related activities. Similarly, Okumu (2008) found out that high academic attainment of mother or the father significantly reduced primary school dropout in rural or urban areas. The lack of time availability indicated demand for child labour at home, lack of interest in schooling by the child and lack of appreciation of child schooling by their parents. The combination of these factors has caused absenteeism. Thus regardless of child’s IQ would miss class, fail examination and repeat. This was common in upper primary pupils in Uganda where 15% to 17% such level of absenteeism were observed to lead to wastage.

Musisi (2003) observed in his research that rampant absenteeism and family not valuing education as the causes of wastage in Uganda. Gachie (2003) outlined the causes of repetition as, parents feeling that pupils scored better grades given a second chance. This happened where the level of parents’ education was high that ensured that the children remained in school. Children of working class were prepared by their mothers for passive role in school and accepted that the school
was somewhere to put up with until release was possible (Nkinyangi, 1980). Thus the parental occupation was noted to influence the child’s education positively.

In Kenya and Burundi repetition occurred in the final year of primary education cycle. Students allowed to repeat were selected for their high academic as ways to prepare them compete for a limited secondary school openings (Elsemon and Schwille, 1991). Therefore grade repetition persisted because parents believed repeating of grades were preferably for promotion when students had achieved poorly, however any form repetition had known to lead to dropout.

2.8 The influence of early marriages on wastage rate

Social- cultural factors such as customs and beliefs have influenced decision to withdraw children from school (Chege and Sifuna 2006). Cultural factors such as initiation ceremonies and gender socialization made the pupils withdraw from school and participate in initiation festivals. FGM was many ages old in Liberia, as it was scheduled to conflict with the school calendars, leading to absenteeism. FGM was initiation into womanhood and girls who underwent them withdrew from school to marry while others did not return to formal schooling (Wamahiu and Njau, 1994). Those who remained began to play truancy and ended up repeating or withdrawing. The Anti- FGM campaign in North Rift of Kenya attributed FGM to girls’ dropout in Pokot. In some communities initiates were
considered ready to meet the traditional obligations and pressure was mounted on them to leave school (Abagi, 1997).

Girls dropped out of schools in Pangani in Tanzania to marry and bring dowry to her family (Mbunda, 1983). According to Odaga and Heneveld (1995) parents were worried about wasting their money on girl’s education who might marry before completing their schooling and become part of another family and hence parental investment would be lost. This forced parents to withdraw their girls from school early to marry them off so as to achieve recognition in the community. In Rongai, parents married off their daughters secretly for economic gain while other parents withdrew them from school and married them off to prevent pregnancies and evade paying school fees.

Anderson (1978) found that large family sizes and low disposable income led to priority being given out to boys leaving out girls. Further families with orphaned children were headed by guardians who sent their own children to school and offer the orphaned under their care as house helps. Thus family sizes and low disposal income were found to encourage early marriages.

2.9. Summary of literature review

The literature review has looked at the status of public primary schools from global point of view down to the status of individual countries. The concept of wastage in education system has also been defined. The global perspective on
wastage in education has identified grade repetition and drop out as the major challenges facing primary schools globally. However, the socioeconomic factors specifically family income, educational cost, family level of education and social cultural factors have all displayed their negative influence on educational wastage, thus wastage as reviewed in the literature attests that wastage in education has remained a serious impediment to the goals of EFA. This study therefore has looked into the wholesome of factors influencing wastage in the public primary school system by reviewing other researchers’ findings and recommendations.

2.10 Theoretical framework

Theoretical framework is the basis on which the entire research rests (Sekarah, 1992). The researcher based this study on the Demand Theory which was a fundamental principle of micro- economics that was first raised by French economist notably Alfred Marshall (1842-1942), Italian Halian Vilfredo (1848-1923), Soviet Eugene Slutsky (1880-1948) and American Kenneth Arrow (1921) who further developed this theory. According to Geoff (2006), the Law of Demand ceteris paribus states that there was inverse relationship between the price of a good and demand. If the price of a good or service increased, then the quantity demanded decreased and vice versa. Demand was the relationship between the price of a good or a service and the amount of it that the consumers were willing to buy (Clark and Vaseth, 1987). Hanson (1986) further defined
demand as the amount of goods and services that people were prepared to buy at any given price over a definite period of time. This theory examined purchasing decisions of consumers and the subsequent price.

There were indirect costs namely uniform and transport that exerted downward pressure on demand even on a free tuition environment Chiuri and Kiumi (2005). Opportunity costs affected demand for education in that considering the opportunity costs for any long term investment in education, low income households were likely to have their children engaged in paid earnings. Todaro (1985) advanced the fact that demand for education was inversely related to the direct costs and its private demand. Thus a decrease in education costs would increase enrolment and retention.

McMahon (1995) and Shultz (1995) examined the effects of the per capita income, education costs and population growth on enrolments and school expenditure patterns using simple demand and supply models to establish the determinants of school demand. The price would relate to education costs and family income while demand was the number of students and families that could afford education. When education costs were high, demand for education was low as evidenced by the rise in dropout rates while children from low family income were likely to withdraw from School as the opportunity costs of their time increased. Okumu (2008) found out that high academic attainment of the mother and father significantly reduced the chances of primary school wastage. Similarly,
in this study, price related to parental level of education while demand was the number of pupils who did not withdraw, hence the higher the academic attainment the more the demand for education. The achievement of vision 2030 would be through investment in education that meets the demand for future manpower. Thus an increase in demand for education needed decreased educational cost and wastage through early marriages and increased education of the school age population that guaranteed future income. Therefore in the entire research study demand theory was used to establish the demand.

2.11 Conceptual Framework

The interactive framework shows that there were several factors that were attributed to wastage in public primary schools.

These factors were related to socio- economic challenges as conceptualized in figure 2.1 below.
Figure 1: Factors that influence wastage of pupils
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Figure 1 shows family income, education costs, family level of education and early marriages as independent variables while wastage rate as dependent variables. It showed that education imposed financial burden to pupils whose parents’ income was low. The cost of education to household made them
withdraw their children pre-maturely because of interaction of poverty with educational costs. The family education contributed towards the child’s progress in school. Homes that provided scholastic materials motivated their children to remain in school because their parents also provided literate environment for their children because they have interest in education. Children of parents with low level of education or none were demotivated by their parents who have no set goals for their children. Additionally social cultural factors such as initiation ceremonies were attributed to pupils’ failure to complete primary education. In some communities where circumcision was practiced pupils withdrew to participate in initiation ceremonies. Fears of early pregnancy or marrying before completing their schooling would also influence parents to withdraw their children from school.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The research methodology that was employed in this study included the research design, target population, sampling techniques, sample size, research instrument, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The Descriptive survey design was used in this study. Descriptive survey design is defined as a process of collecting data in order to answer questions concerning the current status of the subjects in the study (Gay, 1992). Survey was defined as the collection of data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables. It was used to explain or explore the existing variable status of two or more variables at a given point of time (Mugenda, 2003). This method was suitable as it gave a description of affairs as they existed at that time where the researcher had no control over the variables but only reported what had happened or was happening.

3.3 The Target Population

The target population has been defined as all members of a real or hypothetical set of people and events to which investigator wishes to generalize the results of the research study (Borg and Gall, 1999). The target population of this study will
consist of 16 public primary schools of the Igembe East Division. The population will constitute all the 16 head teachers, 202 teachers and 1657 pupils.

3.4 The Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A sample has been explained as a small proportion of the target population selected using some systematic procedures for the study (Kothari, 1995). The sampling frame of this study was divided into homogenous subgroups; hence stratified random sampling method was used to obtain a sample on the basis of designation. The subgroup consisted of head teachers, teachers and pupils who were represented proportionally within the sample.

A sample of 16 public primary schools in Igembe East Division was purposively selected for the purpose of the study that represented the total number of public primary schools in that division. For the purpose of this study the researcher purposively sampled all the school head teachers because of the few numbers of schools in the region. However the table for determining sample size from a given population suggested that when the population size from a given population was 202 and 1657 their sample sizes were 132 and 313 respectively (Mulusa, 1988). This was because the sample sizes were the representative of diverse, generalizable results that would produce accurate results that could be interpreted with certainty (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). Based on the above, a sample size of 461 was considered.
3.5 Research Instruments

The main research instruments used in this study were interviews for the head teachers as well as questionnaire for the teachers and students. The interviews collected information about family level of income and education, cost of education and early marriages. According to Oppenheim (1992) questionnaires offered considerable advantages in their administration and Gay (1992) maintained that questionnaires gave respondents freedom to express their views and made their suggestions. The questionnaires for the teachers and pupils collected the background information about gender, qualification, experience and training level. The research tools also sought the influence of family level of income, educational costs, and family level of education, early marriages and policy intervention on wastage in education.

3.5.1 Validity of the instruments

According to Orodho (2008) validity is the degree to which empirical measures of concept accurately measure the concept under study. The three types of data that were considered in this research were; the content validity which was a non – statistical method used to validate the content employed in the questionnaire (Orodho, 2008). To test validity the researcher relied on the expert judgment of the supervisor who read the questionnaires and comments on the coverage of the objectives. Any suggestion and comments by the supervisors were adhered to.
Construct validity is a measure to which data obtained from an instrument accurately represented a theoretical concept (Borg and Gall, 1996). Construct validity was enhanced by using two different instruments which measured the same concept.

### 3.5.2 Reliability of the instruments

The reliability of an instrument is a measure of the degree to which research results yield consistency results after repeated trials (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). To test for the reliability of the instrument, a test-retest of the tools was carried out throughout the pilot study. The researcher then selected a suitable group of subjects and administered the test to them while keeping all the conditions constant for all subjects. The researcher administered the same instrument to the same subjects again to ascertain their reliability. Pre-testing of questionnaire and interview was done in order to ensure reliability and validity of the instrument using Spearman rank correlation coefficient statistical technique that was used to determine the extent of correlation.

\[
    r = \frac{N\bar{XY} - (\bar{X})(\bar{Y})}{\sqrt{N\bar{X}^2 - (\bar{X})^2} \sqrt{N\bar{Y}^2 - (\bar{Y})^2}}
\]

For the case of this study, a correlation coefficient of 0.8 is was considered reliable (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).
3.6 **Data Collection Procedure**

The researcher sought a permit from the National Council of Science and Technology so as to collect data from the sampled primary schools in Igembe South District. The D.E.O Igembe South District wrote to schools about the intended research to the sampled schools. The researcher then visited the schools for data collection after making an appointment with the head teachers. The questionnaires administered to teachers, pupils and the head teachers interviews were collected and conducted on a settled date respectively.

3.7 **Data analysis techniques**

Data analysis techniques may be defined as a statistical method for data analysis so that they can be interpreted (Kerlinger, 1973). The data was then analyzed using the quantitative and qualitative methods. To analyze the data using quantitative method the researcher used Statistical Package for Social Sciences, figures, frequency tables, percentages, pie charts, bar charts and tabular forms. This was deemed to be easy in interpretation and was convenient in giving general overview of the problem under study. Qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis by organizing data into themes and subtopics. The researcher then made conclusions of the content and data analyses of the instruments that were not quantified.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1: Introduction

This chapter presents the data presentation, findings, analysis and discussion. The purpose of this study was to investigate the socioeconomic factors that influenced wastage of pupils in public primary schools in Igembe East Division of Igembe South District. The analysis was based on the research objectives.

4.2: Questionnaire Response Rate

This section deals with demographic information of the respondent who constitutes the head teacher, teachers and pupils. Demographic information captured data on age, gender, level of education, their corresponding income levels and social cultural factors of respondent.

Table 4.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Not responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 461 questionnaires were issued to the respondents who constituted 16 head teachers, 132 teachers and 313 students. A total of 15 head teachers, 75 teachers and 290 students filled and returned the tools. The corresponding
response rates were therefore 94%, 57% and 93% respectively. The distribution is as shown in the table above whereby an overall response rate of 82% was obtained.

4.3 Demographic Information of the respondents

This section deals with demographic information of the respondent who constitute the head teacher, teachers and pupils. Demographic information captured data on age, gender, level of education, their corresponding income levels and social cultural factors of respondent.

4.4: Gender of the Respondents

The study sought to determine the composition of gender in terms of sex and therefore frequency of counts of responses were done and their respective percentages were calculated as shown in the table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Gender of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings of table 4.2 above the study found out that majority of the respondents as shown by 60% were males whereas 40% of the respondent
indicated that they were females. This is an indication that both genders were involved in this study and thus the finding of the study would not suffer from gender biasness

4.5 Age of the pupils

The study sought to establish the age of the respondents and also find out whether their ages were the right ones for one to be in a primary school.

Table 4.3  Age bracket which best describes the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of pupils</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 21 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the age of the respondents the study found out that 69% of the respondent indicated that they were aged between 11 to 15 years, 27% of the respondent indicated that they were aged between 5 and 10 Years, 3% of the respondent indicated that they were aged between 16 and 20 years whereas 1% of the respondent indicated that they were aged over 21 years, this clearly shows that the ages of the pupils were well distributed in terms of their ages. The data reveals
that all the respondents 99% were of the right age and hence had an opportunity to pursue their education, however one pupil who was above 21 years revealed that there was wastage. This meant that pupils might have dropped out and rejoined at a later date. This might also be an indication that pupils have repeated many times in different classes.

4.6 : The Age of the Head teachers

Table 4.4 below represents the age brackets of the head teachers. The table shows that 19(3%) of the head teachers are aged 30 years and below, 7(44%) are between 31 – 45 years and 6(38%) are between 46 – 60 years. This shows that the ages of the headteachers are well distributed. The table also shows that the majority of the head teachers are above 31 years of age. This may indicate that all the head teachers have had enough experience in the teaching profession hence have had more exposure to human resource management which are necessary for carrying out their supervisory roles in their respective primary schools.

Table 4.4 : The age bracket that best describes the head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of pupils</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7: The Level of Education of the Head teachers and Teachers

Table 4.5: Academic Qualification of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Headteacher Frequency</th>
<th>Teachers Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree (B.E.D)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study required the head teachers and teachers to indicate their level of education. According to the study findings, majority of the respondents indicated that they had P1 and others had ATS 1, diploma and degree levels of education. This level of education evidences that the majority of head teachers and teachers had attained the minimum TSC academic requirement (P1) for recruiting teachers to primary school and all had undergone formal stages of being classroom teachers and senior teachers that MoEST allows to head in public primary schools in Kenya. Further both the head teachers and teachers had sufficient education to enable them supervise their respective positions efficiently in public primary schools.
The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic factors that would influence wastage of pupils in which their parents’ level of education was considered as major contributing factor to wastage. Thus it’s not only the level of education of the parents that would contribute to wastage but also that of head teachers and teachers as well would influence teachers’ effectiveness in understanding, identifying and hence reducing wastage in public primary schools from good education background.

4.8: Influence of Family Income on Wastage in Education

The respondents were asked to indicate family’s monthly income is indicated in table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-6000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the field reveal that, majority (69%) indicated that their parents level of income ranged between Ksh 4000-6000 as indicated by 69%, less than Ksh 3000 as shown by 28% and above Ksh 6000 as shown by 3% respectively,
meaning that the levels of income are low and families whose income is low would increase wastage in the school since not many parents would be able to meet the educational cost and requirements of their children. This is because parents are expected to provide meals, teaching learning materials, medical care and clothing. However due to low level of income some families would opt to forego educational needs of the child and provide the other basics. This seems to create a bloated family budget hence, some learners will repeat or drop from school.

4.9: The Occupation of the Parents

The respondents were asked to explain the occupation the occupation of their parents. According to the study findings, the majority of the respondents indicated that their parents were self employed as presented by 66% while the rest as shown by 34% indicated that their parents were employed. The fact that majority of the parents were not employed would mean that they were involved in peasant farming which would not manage to raise enough money to feed and support learning of the child. Peasant farming employs traditional methods of farming and utilizes family labour. This information is also presented in the figure 4.7 below.
The parental occupation which according to this research study found out to be the sole determinant of family sources of income. However the family labour which involve children made the opportunity costs of sending a child to school high and therefore demand for education to the household level was lower. This is because parents are expected to provide clothing, transport to and from school, daily meals, pay for water. This should seem to increase costs of education and costs of family upkeep, but their occupation yields low income. This may cause learners to either repeat or withdraw.

This study was further to establish whether family income would influence wastage of students in form of dropout since their enrollment.

Majority of the respondents (70%) indicated that there were children who dropped from the school since enrollment while only 30% were of the view that there were no drop outs in the school since enrolment.
The 30% category indicated that there were no dropout since some of them may have joined their current school from other schools. However, the 70% that indicated otherwise was a large number by any standards. These findings of the study concurred with the earlier findings by the MOEST (2008) who established that the national dropout rate was 3.5%. The dropout may have been caused by orphaned children who longer could provide income and poverty levels among parents.

The researcher also asked the respondents in table 4.7 below to indicate some of the reasons that caused school dropouts in their schools. According to the results from the field, majority (36%) of the respondents indicated that lack of school supplies poor parental motivation by 12%, poverty indicated by 23% and repetition indicated by 29%. However lack of school supplies and repetition were found out to be the main factors that influenced wastage.

### Table 4.7: Perceptions of pupils’ views for dropping out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of school supplies</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parental motivation</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be noted from table 4.8 that lack of school supplies 136(36%) and 111(29%) are the major contributors of wastage in public primary schools. This agrees with Abagi (2007) that availability of scholastic materials retain pupils in school. Further this research is in accord with the findings of Elsemon and Echwille (1991) who concluded in his study that any form of repetition may lead to dropouts. Parents lack money to provide basic needs for their families. Hence, it would not be possible to provide money for school supplies. Further, repetition due poverty and lack of class concentration due to malnutrition. These seem to lower retention rates and hence, withdrawal of pupils from school.

**Effects of adequate household income on educational output**

The respondents were asked to explain the effect of adequate household income on educational output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the question on whether educational output will improve if household’s income is enough for the provision of home and school requirement, it was clear
from the findings of table 4.9 that majority of the respondents as shown by 79% were of the view that educational output would improve if household’s income is enough for the provision of home and school requirement while only a few as shown by 21% said that educational output would never improve if household’s income is enough for the provision of home and school requirement. Thus the results on the pupils’ opinion concur with the research done by Akale (2007) which indicated that parent’s poor income insufficient to sustain academic and personal social of student may cause low class concentration.

**Figure 3: Educational output will improve if household’s income improves**

The pie chart of table 4.10 shows that 79% depicts a situation where poverty is high. The consequences of this explains that basic home requirement namely shelter, food, clothing, school requirement and general school infrastructure were
not available. However if the income improved then the entire requirements would be provided. It would therefore be concluded that educational output would only improve if households’ income improved.

Family income plays a crucial role in the education of the child. This is because a family improved income will be able to provide first her basic needs besides providing money for school feeding programmes, meals, extra tuition, teaching and learning materials. The family that provides these to their children will improve educational output. However it was important to note from this research study that family income was the best predictor of children’s output in the education.

Table 4.9: Levels of poverty of the households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Poverty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor families</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich families</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average families</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study required the teachers and the head teachers were asked to indicate the level of the family background of the majority of the dropouts. The study noted from the table 4.9 above that the family background of the majority of the dropouts were from average families as shown by 41%, poor families as shown by 37% while others indicated that some students came from rich families as
shown by 22% respectively. The teachers’ opinion concurred with the research study carried out by UNESCO (2007) and Wanjohi (2002) that in sub-Saharan Africa two thirds of pupils who had enrolled in primary school withdrew before the end of education cycle due to low income.

Most households in developing countries spend less than a dollar in a day which means that some families do not have adequate resources that would meet their household daily needs besides providing pupils with enough finances to cater for school stationary. It’s only the rich households with all the resources that provide literacy environment and commit huge sums of money for the education of their children. However the average and poor families seem to be affected by low levels of income which could affect provision of decent meals for the families, uniform teaching, learning materials and extra tuition. Lack of these will result into drop out and repetition of pupils in primary schools.

**The effects of family income on wastage**

The effect of family income on wastage in education is as shown in table 4.11 below:
Table 4.10: The effect of family income on wastage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to explain how the level of family income affect wastage in their schools. Result from Table 4.10 reveal that shown in table 4.10, majority of the respondents as presented by 57% identified that family income influenced wastage to a high extent, 36% identified that family income influenced wastage to an average extent whereas 8% indicated that family income influenced wastage to a low extent. This therefore indicated that the level of income of the parents was really a determinant on the wastage levels in the schools sampled, which also concurred with Brunefruth (2006) and Cordossos (2007) who also found out that poverty was the prime reason for the pupils’ premature withdrawal from schools. It can therefore be deduced that pupils who dropped were influenced by their families’ low income.

This might be because the resources at the households’ disposable income were scarce hence could not enable the household to purchase education. This study therefore concludes that low families disposable income could not cater for
families needs besides school requirements namely books, stationery, transport and pocket money, for this reason high dropout rate and low retention rates due to low family income greatly influences wastage in education.

The study was required to establish the level of influence of poverty towards wastage in primary school.

**Table 4.11: Rating on influence of poverty to withdrawals in primary schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed that, (67%) that the level of influence of poverty towards wastage in the school was very high, 33% indicated it was average whereas 1% indicated that it was low. This was an indication that children’s poor economic background influenced wastage in the school. The school head teachers as well as the teachers also confirmed that children’s poor economic background influenced wastage in the school. These findings have concurred with Brunefruth (2006) who found out that poverty was the reason that made pupils to withdraw started from
school. From the foregoing findings it is correct to conclude that poverty discouraged parents from investing in their children’s education. This is because some parents cannot afford to pay money to carry out school repairs, build new classrooms neither provide clean water nor support food program at school. Thus children growing up in poverty households are disadvantaged and most likely to withdrawal from school.

**4.10: Influence of cost of education on wastage of pupils**

The respondents were asked to explain the types of levies charged in the school.

**Figure 4.5: Types of levies charged in the school**
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The study was to establish the type of levy charged in the school. Result in figure 4.5 revealed that, majority of the respondents as shown by 50% identified that development fee, 20% identified 50% tuition fee while 30% identified was examination fee. Most of the school heads also added that educational costs
contributed to high wastage in public primary schools which is in agreement with the research that was carried out in Malawi by Kadzamira and Chibwana (2000) who attributed educational cost to wastage in public primary schools.

From the above research findings of this study, it can be noted with a lot of concern that the low budgetary allocation to the education sector lowered the quantity of inputs namely teachers, physical infrastructure such as classrooms and learning materials and building staff quarters. Parents therefore, have to meet development expenditure and tuition fee and monthly examination fees. That is why the headteachers ask the parents to pay development fee without putting into consideration the income levels of most of the parents. This situation increases the unnecessary cost of education hence making some learners will repeat or drop.

The respondents were asked to explain whether the pupils had ever been sent home for the failure to pay any of the listed levies as shown in table 4.14 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levies</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development fund</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination fees</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition fee</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the study findings of table 4.14, majority of the respondents as (79%) indicated that they had ever been sent home to collect examination fees, 62% development fund, 59% tuition fee, while 57% identified school uniform. The findings of the study indicated that pupils are sent home to collect the school levies. This research is in accord with Chiuri and Kiumi (2005) who noted in their research findings that the government has shifted a burden of erecting physical structures and providing more funds for teachers’ salaries not on the government pay roll, this resulted into pupils being sent home because of school levies. The parents were expected to pay these costs besides providing food that is essential for children’s intellectual development. This is impossible to many parents hence their children would be sent home. This increases drop out and repetition as some pupils may not get money immediately to enable them pay levies while others withdraw.

This study therefore concludes that levies imposed on parents through their children were too many for them to pay. The government hence should enforce the FPE policy to enable parents educate their children and if it has to subsidize education, it has to come up with policies that would be biased towards lowering poverty levels of the household by improving the household income to enhance earning opportunities so that they can as well contribute to school development.
Failure to pay school levies

The study required the respondents to indicate what happened when pupils did not pay school levies as shown in table 4.13 below:

Table 4.13: What happens when pupils do not pay for levies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent them home</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain in school</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents indicated (78%) that children were usually sent home, 12.9% said they remain at home while others 8.7% indicated that they did not know what happened when pupils did not pay for levies. When asked about the reasons why some pupils did not pay school levies, majority of the respondents indicated that poverty levels made it impossible to pay levies. The issue of poverty was found to be the common between the findings of this research and the one that was carried out by EFA (2011) which found out that pupil in Burkina Faso, Uganda, Zambia and Kenya dropped out due to high educational cost.

This study has established that pupils who failed to pay school levies were sent home. This could lead to students’ withdrawal or repeating before they completed or enrolled for their national examination because some are orphaned or are under
the care of a guardian who would provide meal and accommodation only. This may lead to pupils already enrolled failing to complete their course. Similarly students sent home regularly for levies that were not available lacked school books that may issued in their absence necessary for retention of pupils in school. The educational costs being too high might influence low completion rates in public primary schools.

The respondents were asked to indicate what happened to those who couldn’t raise levies. According to the results obtained from the field indicated they could not raise levies and ended up withdrawing from the school 79%, while 21% others were exempted. The student opinion on the status of those pupils who could not pay the school levies concurred with the teachers and the head teachers’ opinion.

The findings of the research further is in agreement with the other research finding carried out by Hunt (2008) who found out parental inability to afford education cost made pupils withdraw from school.

From the above it could be concluded that most pupils whose parents couldn’t raise school fees withdrew their children from school while those that were exempted 80(21 percent) was due to special consideration like one or two of their parents. This study noted that children who dropped out was due to poverty related issues family instability, initiation, and cheap labour to the community. However, poverty has been cited as the strongest factor that influences repetition
and drop out. The withdraw from school and their parents engage them in carrying out domestic chores at their homes.

The respondents were asked to indicate the main factors that contributed to poor levy payment in their schools. The results are shown in table 4.14 below.

**Table 4.14: Main factors that will contribute to poor levy payment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies too high</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents refuse to pay</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents indicated that levies were too high as indicated 43%, parent’s refusal to pay as identified by 23%, poverty as indicated by 30% and those who indicated that they did know as shown by 4%.

The problem of paying school levies is prevalent in public primary schools in Igembe because as its seen in the above table 4.14. School levies decided by the school administration contributed to extra burden on the part of the parents. The cumulative figure required and seen at the end of every year in public primary schools reflected large amounts of money that pupils from poor families were
unable to afford. Thus poor levy payment among the parents may be attributed to low completion rates and low grade progress from one grade to another.

The respondents were asked by the study to indicate the extent of agreement that education costs could influence wastage. From the table 4.18 below, majority of the respondents (46%) agreed that education cost can influence wastage, 23% strongly agreed, 26% strongly disagreed while 4% disagreed. This was an indication that education costs could influence repetition and dropout. Similar result were reported by Coclough (2003) who attributed direct and indirect cost of schooling to factors that influenced wastage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement that education costs can influence wastage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the foregoing information it can be noted that 46% and 23% were in agreement that educational costs would influence wastage. However, 26% and 4% have disagreed that it did not. The disagreement arose probably because some of the pupils had parents whose illiteracy levels were high and this had significant effect due to their ignorance in paying school fees. Pupils might as well not have
known the poverty levels in their household that made their parents not to pay school fees. It has been noted that the causes of the internal inefficiency had been established as dropout and absenteeism and repetition. The causes were mainly influenced by parental inability to meet the educational cost. This is because other expenditure namely meals, extra tuition, learning materials is needed besides misuse and underutilization of the inputs and other factors like inadequate use of education resources. These increases educational cost and this situation low retention and completion rates.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether free primary education funds was enough to support learning of the pupils in the sampled schools, majority of the respondents 67% indicated the funds were not enough while the rest 33% said the funds were never enough. The headteachers view on inadequacy of FPE capitation is in concurrence with Kiumi and Chiuri (2005) view that FPE allocation by government was not enough.

The parents were expected to contribute more money to fill the financial gap left by the government for proper school running. However due to high levels of poverty, some parents lacked money to meet school expenditure of paying P.T.A, teachers and school development. The delay in payment would have adverse effect on general school development hence pupils are required to pay this money promptly. These costs are out of reach of many parents hence, many children will drop out.
4.11: Where the school management get funds to top up school budget

On the question on whether the school management got funds to top up the budget to avoid school wastage, majority of the respondents indicated that the school committee usually arranged for meetings that are set to discuss the sources of the funds. The School Heads indicated that most of the funds were given by the parents. Other school heads indicated that fundraisers organized fundraisings or sale of some agricultural products within the school compound to raise funds for the school.

The head teacher revealed that schools obtained finances to run their schools from the levies charged from parents. This has made many head teachers unable to plan for various school expenses or yearly budget as majority of the parents were unable to pay the required levies in lumpsum. The resultant cash flow problem becomes a major school handicap to school capacity to source quality goods and service at the right time. This forces the head teachers to pay above premium or obtain resources on credit thus increasing cost of education and the result therefore will be low retention and completion rates.
4.12: The influence of the family level of education on wastage

Table 4.16: Mothers’ academic level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was to establish the level of education of the pupil’s mothers. According to the results displayed in the table 4.16 above, majority of the respondents as shown by 52% of the students said KCPE, 38% said KCSE, 7% said diploma while 3% said degree. This was an indication that majority of the parents were at least educated having acquired primary level of education. This study therefore concluded that with household having acquired basic education, they were expected to assist their children progress in school. However despite this basic level of education, much wastage continued to be witnessed in this area. This was possibly because basic level of education of the household members was not utilized to the maximum to ensure their knowledge increased that of their children. This was because mothers were pre-occupied with house chores at the expense of her children’s school assignment, may result to pupils repeating or dropping.
Pupils were also asked to indicate their fathers level of education. Table 4.17 displays these results:

**Table 4.17: Fathers’ academic level of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results reveal that, majority (50%) of their fathers had reached primary level of education having acquired KCPE certificates, KCSE as indicated by 40%, diploma as identified by 7% and degree as shown by 3% an indication that the fathers were at least educated having acquired primary level of education.

Table 4.17 found out that the majority of the male parents had acquired primary education. It’s then expected that the social rate of return for primary education is expected to be higher than is in any other level of education, that is fewer cases of repetition and dropout of pupils was expected as almost every parent had acquired basic education. These findings disagrees with the one in the literature review where it was found that the quantity of education attained by the child was closely associated with parents educational attainment. This disagreement arose from the fact that pupils’ fathers spend much of their time in transacting business that may improve his family income, therefore spares no time to help
their children progress in education. This lowers class attendance and may increase repetition and drop out rates in schools.

On the ways parents could be involved in the child’s education, most of the respondents indicated that the parents were unable to purchase appropriate text books that can support the level of education of the pupils, and that some parents assist their children in doing homework.

Results from the field revealed that (94%) of the respondents in table 4.18 below indicated that parental involvement in education would improve output while the rest of the respondents indicated that parental involvement in education would not improve education output of their pupils. The parental involvement not only inspires the pupils to work harder but also improves child’s retention and lowers repetition rates in school. This is because pupils in trying to please their parents will be willing to spend much of their time in school.

Table 4.18: Opinion on whether parental involvement in education improve output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The finding of this research study was in agreement with Appleton (1995) who in his research found out that parental education enhanced parental contribution towards a child’s progress in school, but the level of parental involvement would mainly be determined by the level of education because educated parents understand many issues in education. Thus for example their involvements would encompass provision of some or all basic needs that one would require in order to be retained in school. The parent would also provide literacy environment and materials that would encourage pupils to remain in school.

According to the findings, from the field 85% of the respondents indicated that parental level of education influenced child’ wastage in school while the rest 15% of the respondents were of the view that parental level of education did not influence child’ wastage in school. The result of finding of this research is in agreement with earlier research that was carried by Nannyonjo (2007) and Okumu (2008) who both were of the view that the academic attainment of the parent...
would significantly reduce the wastage of pupils in public primary schools. Therefore from the above findings it can be concluded that parental level of education greatly influence wastage.

The educated parents had privately benefited from their investment in education. Some had secured employment and had climbed the ladder with corresponding remuneration. The educated parents felt motivated as the benefits that accrued from education like compensation from the employer were commensurate to their level of education with higher remuneration, hence parents financial ability to educate their children in well equipped pre-primary and primary schools who latter fared well in national examinations while those with lower level or none of education had lower chances of completing any given education cycle, probably because poverty and poor parental motivation. This situation that dropout and repetition tended to decrease with increased levels of education and increased with decreasing levels of education.

The respondents were asked to explain the level of parental involvement in education in the schools were the results in the table 4.19 below:
Table 4.19: Level of parental involvement in education in the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents (32%) indicated that the level of parental involvement in education in their school was very low, 30% indicated low, 26% indicated average, while 10% said it was high. These results indicate that the level of parental involvement in education is low. This means parents may not be valuing education as Musisi (2003) noted in his research findings that the education would result into wastage. The study therefore concludes that the increasing level of parental involvement would be indirectly proportional to wastage in education.

The low level of parental participation may indicate that lack of parental involvement ensured that their children’s education needs were not catered for. This was because child labour has become crucial for family survival as they are considered economic assets. Child labour is increasingly employed in domestic activities, in agriculture and in petty businesses of both trade in rural areas in poor households have carefully analyzed the opportunity costs of education. The parents have hence continued to engage their children especially girls to labour.
market. Boys and girls in agricultural areas of Igembe have abandoned school in order to earn money as miraa harvesters. It is therefore important that the parental level of involvements in education be significantly increased so as to decrease affected the repetition and drop out of pupils in education in Igembe.

The researcher was also to establish whether with full parental involvement in boys and girls education, the educational outcomes in the school would greatly improve.

The analysis of this study revealed that with full parental involvement the educational outcome of the pupil would greatly improve. These findings agreed with the earlier finding were carried out by Holmes (2003) and Wamahiu (2005) who found that parents who assist their children with materials and moral support progress in education.

The parental input in education greatly improves the output of pupils’ education. However, this would depend on families’ level of income that determines the parents’ capacity to provide school supplies and other needs related to education. Further the families’ level of education mainly determined the parents’ level of assistance in terms of ensuring that pupils are motivated to be in school, this will increase completion rates in our primary school.
4.13: Early Marriages of Pupils

The respondents also indicated peer pressure, parental pressure and personal interests as some of the indicators as to why boys and girls withdrew from school and marry. These results have also been presented in the figure 4.5 below. The results on the influence of early marriages on wastage concurred with the research that was done by Mbunda (1983) who found out that girls withdrew from school in Pangani in Tanzania to marry and bring dowry to her family. Wanjohi (2002) further agrees with these findings that parents in Rongai marry off their daughters for economic gain. Odaga and Henveled (1995) agreed with the findings of this research that pupils are married off for one to achieve social status in the community.

This study further agrees with the research study that was carried out by Musau (2007) who attributed pregnancy to wastage in education. It can be further noted that economic reasons and poverty levels rank first and second respectively. Teachers and head teachers lamented that the two variables were the major stumbling block to education because different families had varying degrees of levels of poverty and household income. Early pregnancy and marriages among the dropouts leave the children with no one to educate him or her who results to taking drugs. Further early marriages and pregnancies among the pupils’ result in girls withdrawing from school as well as getting married. Students withdraw from school because of lack of commitment by their parents and peer pressure on part
of the students where some urged others to withdraw. However, poverty and economic reasons seemed to increase early marriages among the pupils. This may make some learners to withdraw midway to go and deliver and others rejoin school as repeaters.

**Why boys and girls withdraw from school**

The respondents were asked to explain factors that influence boys and girls to withdraw from school as figure 5 reveals:

**Figure 5: What influences both boys and girls to withdraw from school and marry**

Abagi (1997) in his research concluded that some communities considered initiates as ready to meet their traditional obligations and pressure was mounted on them to withdraw from school. Further Wamahiu and Njau (1994) noted in their research finding that FGM was initiation into womanhood and the girls who were circumcised withdrew from school and marry. Thus the results of this study
and those that were carried out by Njau and Wamaihu were in concurrence with this study.

Initiation of both boys and girls tend to instill into them an impression that they are mature thus, making them to carefully analyze the opportunity cost of being in school. As a result both boys and girls entered into the labour market and engaged themselves in petty businesses. Most boys and girls after getting initiated they opted early marriage. On initiation exclusive factors to boys were indiscipline and drug abuse while the higher rate of dropout among females was because of their assertion was that there were factors namely, teenage pregnancies and early marriages that were more prevalent to girls than boys. However poverty, pregnancy, economic reasons, and to a lower degree social status seem to increase and influence pupils to withdraw from school. These have caused low completion rates in public primary schools.

The researcher was still asked to find out the various ways in which female genital mutilation (FGM) affected the education of the pupils in the sampled schools as shown in table 4.20
### Table 4.20  Ways in which FGM affect education of the pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of FGM</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to other schools</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the repeater rate</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the dropout rate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings of table 4.20 has established that most of the respondents as shown by 33% said it brings about the transfer to other schools, 31% said it increases the dropout rates, 27% indicated it increases the repetition rates, while the rest as shown by 10% indicated that they did not know.

The above research findings have concurred with earlier research that was carried out by Michubu, M. (2005) that F.G.M is prevalent and has impact on girls education in Igembe District. It was clear that initiations ceremonies and opportunity cost were prevalent in this district. When students engaged in some of these malpractices like circumcision they left school while others considered themselves mature would engage in the local economic activities. Students engage in such malpractices because of the parental level of education that ensures they stick to their culture. Poverty households are initiate their children so that they stop them being dependent on their families. Other will be initiated due
to peer pressure from their peers. These situations create pupil’s for initiation. This will make some learners to either drop put or repeat classes.

4.14: What should be done to reduce wastage through early marriages

The school head teachers as well as the teachers were required by the study to indicate various ways on what should be done to reduce wastage rate through early marriages. On this question, majority of the respondents indicated that there was the need to sensitize the local community on the issue of early marriages as well as incorporating it in the school curriculum so as to lower the effects of early marriages towards the education of the girl child. Others indicated that it is the specific role of the parents to educate their children on the effects of early marriages to their lives. On the same question, most of the teachers said that the local churches and the organized groups in the area must bear the responsibility of educating the girl child on the need to marry only at the right time of their life and report any dropout that is related to early marriages to the local administration for further legal action.

4.15: What the government should do in order to reduce wastage through early marriages

On the question on what the government should do in order to reduce the rate of wastage through early marriages, the school managers indicated that the governments, through the ministry of education and other education corporations in Kenya should incorporate the issue on FGM and other related issues in the
school curriculum and encourage sessions related to effect of FGM or early marriages on education of pupils in the sampled schools. The respondents also suggested that the government’s policy on readmission of girls after delivery should be adhered to so as to encourage more girls to go back to school and to reduce wastage.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the socioeconomic factors that influence wastage in public primary schools in Igembe East Division of Igembe South District. The specific objectives of the study were: to assess the relationship between the family income on wastage, to establish the influence of educational costs on wastage, to determine the influence of family level of education on wastage and to assess the relationship between early marriages on wastage.

5.2 Summary of study
5.2.1 The influence of family income on wastage
On the influence of the family income to wastage in education, majority of the respondents, mainly students indicated that their parents were self employed as presented by 66% while the rest as shown by 34% were employed. The fact that majority of the parents were not employed would mean that they were involved in Jua kali or farming activities which would not manage to raise enough to feed and support learning of the child leading to wastage in the school. The study also established that parent’s level of income ranged between Ksh 4000-5000 as
shown by 69% and that there were children who dropped from the school since enrollment as was reported by 70%. The study found out that majority of the respondents indicated that lack of school supplies reported by 36%, poor parental motivation represented by 12%, poverty as represented by 23% and repetition as reported by 29% respectively were the main causes of wastage in the sampled schools. It was clear from the findings that majority of the respondents as shown by 79% were of the view that educational output improved if household’s income was enough for the provision of home and school requirement. The study noted that the family background of the majority of the dropouts were from average families as represented by 41% and that 57% said that family income influences wastage to a high extent. Finally, 67% of the respondents agreed that the level of influence of poverty towards wastage in the school was very high.

5.2.2 The influence of costs of education on wastage rate

The study established that majority of the respondents represented by 88% reported development fee, 50% said tuition fee as the main fee that has an influence on wastage rate. Majority of the respondents as presented by 43% indicated that they had ever been sent home for uniform collect school fee, tuition fee as reported by 41%, development funds as reported by 38% and this adversely affected the education of the pupils in form of wastage rate in their school. Majority of the respondents said that children were usually sent home as represented by 78%, 79% said that those pupils who could not raise levies ended
up withdrawing from the school while the majority of the respondents indicated school levies were high due to high levels of poverty whereby some parents also refused to pay. The study also established that majority of the respondents as represented by 46% agreed that education cost could influence wastage and that the funds provided by the government were not so enough as reported by 67%. Finally, the school head teachers indicated that most of the funds were given by the parents and that fundraisers were organized or the sale of some agricultural products incase of any within the school compound to meet the education costs hence avoiding wastage.

5.2.3 The influence of family level of education on wastage rates

According to the results 52% of the respondents who constituted students reported that their mothers had acquired KCPE certificates and that majority of the fathers had also reached primary level education having also acquired KCPE certificates as reported by 50% respectively. The study established that the parents are able to purchase appropriate text books that can support the level of education of the parents, parents assist them in doing homework and that parents assist their children through guidance and counseling while 94% indicated that parental involvement in education improve output. The study found out that 85% of the respondents indicated that parental level of education influence child’ wastage in school while 97% of the respondents agreed that parental involvement in boys and girls education, would improve the education outcomes greatly.
5.2.4 The influence of early marriages on wastage rate

The study found out that 32% of the respondents indicated economic status, 29% indicated poverty and pregnancies respectively as the main reasons that cause early marriages among girls and boys in primary schools. Most of the respondents also indicated that peer pressure, parental pressure and personal interests as some of the indicators as to why boys and girls to withdraw from school and marry. Majority of the respondents as presented by 96% agreed that initiations influence the rate of early marriages and that this brings about the transfer to other schools, increases the repetition rates, and FGM increases the dropout rates respectively.

The study also established that the school managers indicated that the governments, through the ministry of education and other education corporations in Kenya incorporate the issue on FGM and other related issues or encourage sessions related to effect of FGM or early marriages on education of pupils in the sampled schools. Most of the respondents indicated that there was the need to conduct trainings to the locals residents as well as including the issue of early marriages in the school curriculum based on the effects of early marriages towards the education of the girl child and that specific role of the parents to educate their children on the effects of early marriages to their lives should be enhanced. On the same question, most of the teachers said that the local churches and the organized groups in the area must bear the responsibility of educating the
girl child on the need to marry only at the right time of their life. This would reduce the wastage rates respectively.

5.3 Conclusions

This study concludes that most of the parents are self employed a few are employed and which would mean that they are involved in Jua kali or farming activities which would not manage to raise enough to feed and support learning of the child leading to wastage in the school. The study also concludes that parent’s level of income ranged between Ksh 4000-5000 and that there are children who dropped from the school since enrollment because of poor family incomes thereby influencing the wastage rates in the school. The study concludes that the family income cannot meet the purchase of education requirements of the child.

On the influence of costs of education on wastage rate, the study established that there were various types of fee namely; development fee, tuition fee and examination fees respectively whereby most children are sent home to collect. This adversely affected the wastage rate in their school. The study established that the levies are too high and that those pupils who cannot raise levies end up withdrawing from the school thereby leading to wastage. Due to lack of enough, some parents refuse to pay which also affected the wastage rate in their school.

On the influence of family level of education on wastage, the study concludes that most of the parents were at least educated having KCPE or KCSE of levels of
education. This means that parental involvement in boys and girls education, would improve the education outcomes greatly if they would utilize their knowledge in education. The study also established that the parents were unable to purchase appropriate text books that could support education of the pupils. Parents will assist them in doing homework.

On the influence of early marriages on wastage rate the study concludes that most cause early marriages among girls and boys in primary schools are Peer pressure, parental pressure and personal interests are some of the indicators as to why boys and girls to withdraw from school and marry. The study concludes that early marriages and pregnancies brings about the transfer to other schools, increases the repetition rates and any FGM increases the dropout rates which is a measure of wastage.

5.4 Recommendations

The study also recommends that parents be motivated on the need to find ways to raise school fees since most of them are not employed. The study recommends that the government and other donors in the community come in for the purposes of purchase the school requirements which would see parents raise little funds they can easily get to avoid repetition and drop out in the school.

The study recommends that the school management come up with more strategies that would see to it that the education cost are reduced by initiating income
generating project to subsidized education for the poor children from poor socio-economic background. The government should also intervene by increasing the required funds to run the schools.

The study recommends that parents continue in guiding their children on the need of education, assist them in their home works, avoid child labour and offer guidance and counseling to them so as to enhance effective completion of all the classes with good education outputs. On the influence of early marriages, the study recommends that the government through the ministry of education and other education corporations in Kenya incorporate the issue on FGM and other related issues or encourage sessions related topics.

The study also recommends on the need to conduct trainings of the local residents as well as including the issue of early marriages in the school curriculum based on the effects of early marriages towards the education of the girl child and that specific role of the parents to educate their children on the effects of early marriages to their lives should be enhanced. The local churches and administration and the organized groups like NGOs in the area must bear the responsibility of educating the girl child on the need to marry only at the right time of their life. This would reduce the wastage rates respectively.
5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

This study recommends that further study be done in other counties and involve more schools so as to find out whether the same findings as the current ones would be obtained. Other factors which were not discussed in this study since they were not so major also need to be looked into to establish their influence towards socioeconomic factors that influence wastage in public primary schools and other learning institutions in Kenya.
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APPENDICES A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO THE HEAD TEACHERS

Henry Kirimi Mutwota,
University of Nairobi,
Departments of Education
Administration and planning
P.O. Box 92
Kikuyu.

4th May 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF: REQUEST TO FILL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESEARCH PURPOSE

I am a post graduate student in the University of Nairobi pursuing a Master of Education Degree in Economics of Education and I am carrying out a research on social economic factors that influence wastage in public primary schools in Igembe South Division in Kenya.

I am therefore kindly requesting you to respond to the items in the questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. The information that you will give will be used for research purposes only.

Yours faithfully,

Henry Kirimi Mutwota.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDENTS

This questionnaire will investigate the causes of socioeconomic factors on educational wastage in public primary schools. Kindly fill this questionnaire by ticking (√) appropriately or writing your opinion where necessary.

1. Please indicate your gender  Male [ ] Female [ ]
2. What is your age? 5-10yrs [ ] 11-15 [ ] 16-20 [ ] Above 21 yrs

Section A. Family income on education.

3. What is the occupation of your parents? Self-employed [ ] employed [ ]
4. What is your family’s monthly average income in Ksh?
   Less than 3,000 [ ] 4,000 -6,000 [ ] Above 6000 [ ]
5. Are there students who may have dropped since you enrolled?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
6. Indicate why they dropped out of school (Tick at most two). Poverty [ ]
   Lack of school supplies [ ] Poor parental motivation [ ] Repetition [ ]
7. Will educational output improve if household’s income is enough for the provision of home and school requirement? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section B. Cost of education

8. Indicate if you have been sent home for the failure to pay any of the following levies? Development fund [ ] Uniform [ ] Examination fees [ ]
   Tuition fee [ ]
9. For those who do not pay any of the above cost in question 12 promptly what do head teachers do? Sent the home [ ] summon their parent [ ] don’t know [ ] For those who fail to pay these costs what reason do they give?...

Section C. Education of the parent

10. What is your parents’ academic level of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>K.C.P.E</th>
<th>K.C.S.E</th>
<th>DIPLOMA</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In what ways are they involved in your education ways.
1. __________________________ 2. __________________________

12. Will parental involvement in education improve its output? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section D. Early marriages of pupils.

13. What influences both boys and girls to withdraw from school and marry?
   Poverty [ ] Pregnancy [ ] Economic reasons [ ] social status

14. Do initiations influence the rate of marriageability of pupils?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. In what ways does FGM affect Education of the pupils? (Tick at most three)
   Increase the dropout rate [ ] Increase marriage rate [ ]

16. Transfer to other schools [ ] Increase the repeater rate [ ] Do not know [ ]
17. In your opinion what should be done to reduce wastage rate through early marriages?.........................................................................................................................................................

Thank you!!
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TEACHERS.

Section A. Family income on education

1. Are there some students who have dropped out after enrollment? Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. What is their main source of income? Employment [ ] from self employment

3. What is the family background of the majority of the dropouts?
   - Poor families [ ] Rich families [ ] Average Families [ ]

4. What is the effect of family income on wastage? High [ ] average [ ] low [ ]

Section B. Cost of education

5. What type of levy is charged in your school;
   - Development [ ] Tuition [ ] Exams

6. What happens to those who cannot raise levies? Withdraw [ ] exempted [ ]

7. What are the main factors that will contribute to poor levy payment?
   - Poverty [ ] Levies too high [ ] parents refuse to pay [ ] don’t know.

8. In your opinion do you agree that education costs can influence wastage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. What recommendations would you give to address the wastage related education cost?..............................................................................................................................................
Section C. Education of the parents

10. Do parental level of education influence child’s wastage in school

   Yes [  ] No [   ]

11. What is the level of parental involvement in education in your school?

   Low [  ] Average [  ] High [  ] Nil [  ]

12. Do you think that with full parental involvement in boys and girls education, the medicational outcomes in your school will greatly improve?

   Yes [  ] No [  ]

Section D. Early marriages of pupil.

13. Do initiation ceremonies lead to pupils withdrawal in your school? Yes [  ] No [  ]

14. In your opinion do you think FGM contributes to early marriages and subsequent withdrawal?..........................................................

15. What would you recommend to the government in order to reduce the rate of wastage through sociocultural factors?..............................................................

Thank you!!
APPENDIX D

HEADTEACHERS’ INTERVIEW

This questionnaire will investigate the influence of socioeconomic factors on educational wastage in public primary schools. Kindly fill this questionnaire.

Please tick [✓] appropriately or write down your opinion.

1. Kindly indicate your gender   Male [   ]   Female [  ]

2. What is your age? Below 30 yrs [    ]    31-45 yrs [   ]    46-60 yrs [  ]

3. What is the level of your education?........................................................................

Section A. Family income

4. How would you rate the influence of poverty to withdrawals? High [ ] low [ ]
5. How do children’s poor economic background influence wastage in your school?

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

Section B. Cost of education.

6. Is the F.P.E capitation provided by the government adequate?
   Yes [   ]       No [  ]

7. If no in number 9 above, where do you get funds to top up your school budget?
   ........................................................................................................................................

8. What happens to pupils who are unable to pay the school levies?............................

9. In your opinion do educational costs contribute to high wastage in primary?
   ........................................................................................................................................

   97
10. What recommendation will you give address dropout related to educational costs?

……………………………………………………………………………………

Section C. Family level of education

11. Does the family’s level of education influence wastage?

……………………………………

12. Are parents positive about the education of their children in your school?

   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

13. How would you rate the influence of parental education to wastage in your school?

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

14. How can family’s level of education be utilized to reduce wastage in your school?

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

15. What recommendations would you give to address wastage that’s related to early marriage? ……………………..
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