

## CLASS TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE SELECTED FACTORS ON BOY CHILD DROP-OUT IN PUBLIC MIXED DAY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KERICHO COUNTY, KENYA.

Evaline Chelangat Koech and Dr.S.M. Mulambula

Student, Department of Educational Psychology Moi University, Kenya  
and

Senior Lecturer, Department of Educational Psychology Moi University, Kenya

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2022.4589>

IJMSSSR 2023

VOLUME 5

ISSUE 2 MARCH – APRIL

ISSN: 2582 - 0265

**Abstract:** Despite the fact that the government of Kenya has introduced Free Primary Education (FPE) and Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE), many school going age boys have been dropping out of school. School drop-out for boys is a very serious issue not only in Kenya but also in the whole world. Although many studies have been carried out in other parts of Kenya, none has investigated the factors behind the increased dropout of the boy child in secondary education particularly in Kericho County. The main purpose of this study was to investigate class teachers' perceptions on selected factors influencing the boy-child's drop-out in mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County. The objectives of the study were: to examine class teachers' perceptions on the influence of social factors on boy child drop-out, to examine class teachers' perceptions on the influence of economic factors on boy child drop-out and to find out class teachers' perceptions on the influence of school-based factors on boy child dropout. The study used mixed method research design utilizing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The study was guided by Gibson's Theory of Direct Perception and Bronfenbrenner's Biosystems Theory. The research was pragmatic and adopted descriptive survey research design. The target population comprised 176 form 4 class teachers. Multistage sampling was used during sampling whereby 121 schools were sampled to participate in the study. Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table was used to select a sample size of 121 public secondary schools. From the table, 121 form 4 class teachers were sampled purposively. Data was collected using questionnaires. Piloting of the instruments was carried out to ensure reliability which was estimated using split-half reliability. Validity of the instruments was ascertained in relation to the set objectives. Quantitative data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Qualitative data was presented thematically and in narrations and quotations. The findings of the study will be used to provide useful information to the ministry of education policy makers on the implementation of workable strategies that will promote boys' education and provide a basis upon which other studies can be anchored. The results may be of much significance to teachers, parents and students in understanding the factors that influence education retention among the boys and come up with other ways of curbing this drop-out problem.

**Keywords:** Social factors, Economic factors and School-based factors

### 1.0 Introduction

Education is a lifelong process of acquiring knowledge, skills and attitudes that 'begins' at birth and ends at death (Mutwol, 2013). According to Lelei, & Weidman (2012), report on Totally Integrated Quality education and Training (TIQET) in Kenya, education involves deliberate, systematic and sustained efforts to acquire knowledge, attitudes, values, skills as well as any other outcome of that effort that shapes the development of an individual. In accordance with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1949) cited by Supaat and Denson, (2019) 'everyone has a right to education. In 1990, Jomtien in Thailand hosted the world conference on Education for All (EFA). This conference launched the goal of achieving Basic Education for All by the year 2000. Many countries implemented free basic education programs for this reason as they recognized its significant role in economic growth of nations both developed and developing (Dickson, Hughes, & Irfan, 2016).

Success has been adequately recorded in expansion of learning spaces and opportunities in most countries both developed and developing due to high resource allocation in the education sector in the respective countries (UNESCO, 2015). However, gains in education are hampered by dropout problem which has reached epidemic proportions internationally and has become a global problem confronting the education sector worldwide (Khalifa, Gooden, & Davis, 2016). A study by UNESCO (2015) found that about 71 million teenagers have dropped out of school, this has jeopardized economic growth and social cohesion.

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

The Government of Kenya introduced Free Day Secondary Education as a measure of providing education to its citizens. This is because an educated population can make a big contribution to the development of a country. Despite this huge expenditure in providing free education, a substantial amount of this expenditure is spent on those who drop out of school. This is wastage of national resources since the dropouts will not have acquired the knowledge and skills expected of them. School dropout for both boys and girls is a very serious issue not only in Kenya but also in the whole world and the boy child has become vulnerable and is missing out in education. Data from Kericho County shows that the boy child dropout rates over the last five years have continued to rise raising a lot of concern. Boy child dropout is a serious problem because it denies the individual students their fundamental human right to education. This trend is an indication that the number of boys in public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County is consistently declining, which is evidence of a gap that needs bridging. Therefore, this necessitated the study to investigate class teachers' perceptions on social, economic and school-based factors influencing boy-child dropout in public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County.

### 1.2 Research Objective

- i. To find out class teachers' perceptions on the influence of social factors on boy-child drop-out in public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya
- ii. To examine class teachers' perceptions on the influence of economic factors on boy-child drop-out in public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya
- iii. To investigate class teachers' perceptions on the influence of school-based factors on boy-child drop-out in public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya

### 1.0 Theoretical Review

There is need for intervention programs to curb boys' secondary school dropout. Various psychological theories may be applied in addressing the root causes of boy-child dropout. The study will confine itself to Gibson's Theory of Direct Perception and Ecological Systems Theory of Bronfenbrenner. Gibson's Theory of Direct perception explains the perception of class teachers as to what might be contributing to the dropout of boys from secondary schools whereas Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory shows how these environment nurtures these factors. While Gibson's Theory of Direct perception highlight how students are affected directly through interaction with their teachers, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory highlights how students react to the school environment. The two theories highlight how students are affected in one way or another that will lead to their drop out from school. This justifies the use of the two theories.

### 3.0 Research Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design and employed mixed method approach where both quantitative and qualitative data was needed to generate insight into the selected factors influencing boy-child dropout in mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County. Qualitative research explores the problem, honours the voices of the participants and conveys their divergent perspectives (Creswel, 2013). A survey is used to obtain a description of a particular perception about a situation, phenomena or variable and their views are taken to represent the entire population (Kenya Institute of Management, 2009). According to Bacon (2012), this design indicates features of a particular population, either at a fixed point in time or comparative over time. The design was considered appropriate for the study simply because it involved description, recording, making of analysis and making reports on conditions that are in existence or that existed before (Kothari, 2004). Descriptive survey was appropriate because the study involved three categories of respondents which were considered wide and the researcher could not change the independent variables such as family income, family size, cost of education and

child labour; the factors of dropout, that had happened before.

The data collected through survey method is used to evaluate present practices or events and provided a basis for decision making (Bacon, 2012). The survey design will allow the researcher to generalize the research finding (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2017). In this study, the researcher adopted the use of questionnaires to collect quantitative data from the class teachers. The researcher aimed at collecting data from respondents based on their perception on selected factors influencing boy-child drop-out from public mixed day secondary schools in Kericho County, Kenya.

#### 4.1 Results

**Table 1: Class Teacher's Perceptions on Influence of Social Factors on Boy-Child Drop-Out Rate**

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Missing	Mean	StdDev
Peer influence leads to boy-child drop out from school	4 (3.4%)	—	1 (0.9%)	51 (43.6%)	61 (52.1%)	—	1.59	0.822
Love relationship increases school drop-out for boys.	1 (0.9%)	6 (5.1%)	12 (10.3%)	53 (45.3%)	44 (37.6%)	1 (0.9%)	1.85	0.867
Parental ignorance contributes to boy child drop-out from school.	1 (0.9%)	4 (3.4%)	3 (2.6%)	60 (51.3%)	49 (41.9%)	—	1.70	0.757
High level of indiscipline leads to boy-child drop-out.	—	2 (1.7%)	1 (0.9%)	42 (35.9%)	66 (56.4%)	6 (5.1%)	1.45	0.614
Drug/alcohol abuse is a main factor that leads to boy-child drop-out of school.	—	1 (0.9%)	15 (12.8%)	48 (41%)	50 (42.7%)	3 (2.6%)	1.71	0.725
Family disputes contribute to boy-child school drop-out.	1 (0.9%)	14 (12%)	26 (22.2%)	54 (46.2%)	18 (15.4%)	4 (3.4%)	2.35	0.924
Absenteeism leads to boy-child drop-out.	5 (4.3%)	3 (2.6%)	15 (12.8%)	56 (47.9%)	37 (31.6%)	1 (0.9%)	1.99	0.974
Societal beliefs such as boys are stronger than girls contribute to emotional mayhem leading to boy-child school dropout.	8 (6.8%)	42 (35.9%)	20 (17.1%)	36 (30.8%)	11 (9.4%)	—	3.00	1.152
Parents' death contributes to boy-child drop out.	11 (9.4%)	29 (24.8%)	23 (19.7%)	49 (41.9%)	5 (4.3%)	—	2.93	1.104
Herding culture meant for boys leads to boy-child school drop-out.	41 (35%)	37 (31.6%)	6 (5.1%)	27 (23.1%)	6 (5.1%)	—	3.68	1.304

Source: Researcher 2022

**4.1 Results and Discussions Class Teachers' Perception on Influence of Social Factors on Boy-Child Drop-Out Rate** Table 1 shows that, 4 (3.4%) respondents disagreed strongly that peer influence leads to boy-child drop out from school, 1 (0.9%) respondent was neutral, 51 (43.6%) respondents agreed and majority of 61 (52.1%) respondents agreed strongly. The mean was 1.59 with a standard deviation of 0.822. This is because, majority of the respondents strongly agreed to that. The findings of this study are concurrent with the findings of Omollo & Yambo, (2017) who asserted that peer pressure is the principle cause of drop outs not only for boys but

also for girls.

When asked whether love relationship increases school drop-out for boys, 1 (0.9%) participant disagreed strongly, 6 (5.1%) participants disagreed, 12 (10.3%) participants were neutral, majority of 53 (45.3%) participants were in agreement, 44 (37.6%) participants agreed strongly while 1 (0.9%) respondent did not answer. The mean for this was 1.85 with a standard deviation of 0.867, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed that love relationship increases school drop-out for boys. The findings of this study support the findings of the study done by Rumberge&Rotermund, (2012) who insisted that boys who impregnate teenage girls end up dropping out of school.

On whether parental ignorance contributes to boy child drop-out from school, 1 (0.9%) participant disagreed strongly, 4 (3.4%) participants disagreed, 3 (2.6%) participants were neutral, majority of 60 (51.3%) participants agreed and 49 (41.9%) participants agreed strongly. The mean for this was 1.70 with a standard deviation of 0.757, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed that indeed the ignorance level of the parents contributes to boys dropping out of school. Ignorance of the parents creates a rift between children and them, therefore, boys students easily drop out of school due to lack of parental advice because of ignorance (Symeou, et, al., 2012)

Furthermore, when asked whether high level of indiscipline leads to boy-child drop-out, 2 (1.7%) participants disagreed, 1 (0.9%) participant was neutral, 42 (35.9%) participants agreed, majority of 66 (56.4%) participants agreed strongly while 6 (5.1%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 1.45 with a standard deviation of 0.614, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents strongly agreed. The findings of this study corroborates with the findings of the study done by (Snilstveit, et. al., 2017).

On whether drug/alcohol abuse is a main factor that leads to boy-child drop-out of school, 1 (0.9%) participant disagreed, 15 (12.8%) participants were neutral, 48 (41%) participants agreed, majority of 50 (42.7%) participants agreed strongly while 3 (2.6%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 1.71 with a standard deviation of 0.725, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that drug abuse is the main factor that leads to boy-child drop out of school.

On whether family disputes contribute to boy-child school drop-out, 1 (0.9%) respondent strongly disagreed, 14 (12%) participants disagreed, 26 (22.2%) participants were neutral, majority of 54 (46.2%) participants agreed, 18 (15.4%) participants agreed strongly while 4 (3.4%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 2.35 with a standard deviation of 0.924, this is because majority of the respondents agreed to that. The findings of this study are in agreement with findings of the study done by Symeou, et, al., (2012) who insisted that family is the pillar and have disputes therefore, affects the education of the child negatively.

Moreover, the respondents were asked whether absenteeism leads to boy-child drop-out and 5 (4.3%) respondents strongly disagreed. 3 (2.6%) participants disagreed, 15 (12.8%) participants were neutral, majority of 56 (47.9%) participants agreed, 37 (31.6%) participants strongly agreed while 1 (0.9%) respondent did not give his/her views. The mean for this was 1.99 with a standard deviation of 0.974. This is so because, majority of the respondents agreed to that. The findings of this study are in agreement with findings of the study done by Snilstveit, et. al., (2017) who put absenteeism and indiscipline as the main causes of drop out.

8 (6.8%) respondents strongly disagreed when asked whether societal beliefs such as boys are stronger than girls contribute to emotional mayhem leading to boy-child school dropout. Majority of 42 (35.9%) respondents disagreed, 20 (17.1%) respondents were neutral, 36 (30.8%) participants agreed and 11 (9.4%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.152. This is so because, majority of the respondents disagreed to that.

The researcher sought to find out whether parents' death contributes to boy-child drop out, 11 (9.4%) participants strongly disagreed, 29 (24.8%) participants disagreed, 23 (19.7%) participants were neutral, majority of 49 (41.9%) participants agreed and 5 (4.3%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 2.93 with a standard deviation of 1.104, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed that the demise of a parent leads to school drop-out.

The study also sought to find out whether herding culture meant for boys leads to boy-child school drop-out. Majority of 41 (35%) participants strongly disagreed, 37 (31.6%) participants disagreed, 6 (5.1%) participants were neutral, 27 (23.1%) participants agreed and 6 (5.1%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 3.68 with a standard deviation of 1.304, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents strongly disagreed to that. The findings of this study go hand in hand with the findings of the study done by Saliwanchik-Brown, (2009) who slammed the assertion that herding culture of boys leads to drop out of school.

**Table 2: Class Teacher's Perceptions on Influence of Economic Factors on Boy-Child Drop-Out Rate**

Statement (delocalization)	SD	D	N	A	SA	Missing	Mean	Std Dev
Lack of school fees contributes to boy-child drop-out.	17 (14.5%)	19 (16.2%)	11 (9.4%)	45 (38.5%)	20 (17.1%)	5 (4.3%)	2.71	1.352
Desire to contribute to family income generation leads to boy-child school drop-out.	11 (9.4%)	27 (23.1%)	13 (11.1%)	52 (44.4%)	9 (7.7%)	5 (4.3%)	2.81	1.182
Boys pursuing menial jobs leads to school drop-out.	3 (2.6%)	5 (4.3%)	13 (11.1%)	71 (60.7%)	19 (16.2%)	6 (5.1%)	2.12	0.839
Low parental income contributes highly to boy-child drop-out from school.	13 (11.1%)	61 (52.1%)	15 (12.8%)	20 (17.1%)	3 (2.6%)	5 (4.3%)	3.54	1.003
Big family size catalyses boy-child drop-out from school.	34 (29.1%)	55 (47%)	14 (12%)	30 (25.6%)	8 (6.8%)	6 (5.1%)	4.04	0.852
High cost of secondary education leads to boy-child drop-out.	26 (22.2%)	63 (53.8%)	6 (5.1%)	15 (12.8%)	1 (0.9%)	6 (5.1%)	3.88	0.951
Inheritance of family properties contributes to boy-child school drop-out.	20 (17.1%)	37 (31.6%)	14 (12%)	30 (25.6%)	8 (6.8%)	8 (6.8%)	3.28	1.255
High cost of transport to and from the school contributes to boy-child drop-out from school.	16 (13.7%)	34 (29.1%)	16 (13.7%)	37 (31.6%)	8 (6.8%)	6 (5.1%)	3.12	1.227
High cost of remedial classes contributes to boy-child drop-out from school.	12 (10.3%)	11 (9.4%)	9 (7.7%)	54 (46.2%)	26 (22.2%)	5 (4.3%)	2.37	1.245
High cost of teaching and learning materials leads to boy-child drop-out.	13 (11.1%)	7 (6%)	3 (2.6%)	53 (45.3%)	36 (30.8%)	5 (4.3%)	2.18	1.275

Table 2 shows that, 17 (14.5%) respondents strongly disagreed that lack of school fees contributes to boy-child drop-out, 19 (16.2%) respondents disagreed, 11 (9.4%) respondents were neutral, majority of 45 (38.5%) respondents agreed, 20 (17.1%) respondents strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) respondents did not give their views. The mean was 2.71 with a standard deviation of 1.352. This is so because, majority of the respondents agreed to that. The findings of this study are concurrent with the findings of Sabates, et. al., (2010) who argued that most students drop out of school to venture in business due to lack of school fees.

When asked whether desire to contribute to family income generation leads to boy-child school drop-out, 11 (9.4%) participants strongly disagreed, 27 (23.1%) participants disagreed, 13 (11.1%) participants were neutral, majority of 52 (44.4%) participants were in agreement and 9 (7.7%) participants strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) participants to the study did not give their views. The mean for this was 2.81 with a standard deviation of 1.182, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed to that.

Moreover, the study sought to find out whether boys pursuing menial jobs leads to school drop-out. 3 (2.6%) participants strongly disagreed, 5 (4.3%) participants disagreed, 13 (11.1%) participants were neutral, majority of



71 (60.7%) participants were in agreement and 19 (16.2%) participants strongly agreed while 6 (5.1%) participants to the study did not give their views. The mean for this was 2.12 with a standard deviation of 0.839, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed to that. According to Sabates, et. al., (2010), majority of boys involve themselves with menial jobs in order to earn a living or maybe due to peer pressure. This leads to them dropping out of school.

On whether low parental income contributes highly to boy-child drop-out from school, 13 (11.1%) respondents strongly disagreed. Majority of 61 (52.1%) respondents disagreed, 15 (12.8%) respondents were neutral, 20 (17.1%) respondents agreed, 3 (2.6%) respondents strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 3.54 with a standard deviation of 1.003. This is so because, majority of the respondents disagreed to that.

When asked whether big family size catalyses boy-child drop-out from school, 34 (29.1%) respondents strongly disagreed. Majority of 55 (47%) respondents disagreed, 14 (12%) respondents were neutral, 30 (25.6%) respondents agreed, 8 (6.8%) respondents strongly agreed while 6 (5.1%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 4.04 with a standard deviation of 0.852. This is so because, majority of the respondents disagreed to that. The findings of this study are in agreement with findings of the study done by Symeou, et. al., (2012)

Furthermore, the study looked into whether high cost of secondary education leads to boy-child drop-out. 26 (22.2%) respondents strongly disagreed, majority of 63 (53.8%) respondents disagreed, 6 (5.1%) respondents were neutral, 15 (12.8%) respondents agreed, 1 (0.9%) respondent strongly agreed while 6 (5.1%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 3.88 with a standard deviation of 0.951. This is so because, majority of the respondents disagreed to that.

When asked whether inheritance of family properties contributes to boy-child school drop-out, 20 (17.1%) respondents strongly disagreed. Majority of 37 (31.6%) respondents disagreed, 14 (12%) respondents were neutral, 30 (25.6%) respondents agreed, 8 (6.8%) respondents strongly agreed while 8 (6.8%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 3.28 with a standard deviation of 1.255. This is so because, majority of the respondents disagreed to that.

On whether high cost of transport to and from the school contributes to boy-child drop-out from school, 16 (13.7%) respondents strongly disagreed. 34 (29.1%) respondents disagreed, 16 (13.7%) respondents were neutral, majority of 37 (31.6%) respondents agreed, 8 (6.8%) respondents strongly agreed while 6 (5.1%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 3.12 with a standard deviation of 1.227. This is so because, majority of the respondents agreed to that. The findings of this study corroborate with findings of the study done by Subotzky and Prinsloo, (2011) who asserted that travelling for long to reach school is expensive and therefore schools should be brought nearer to students in order to reduce drop out.

Furthermore, the study sought to find out whether high cost of remedial classes contributes to boy-child drop-out from school. 12 (10.3%) respondents strongly disagreed, 11 (9.4%) respondents disagreed, 9 (7.7%) respondents were neutral, majority of 54 (46.2%) respondents agreed, 26 (22.2%) respondents strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 2.37 with a standard deviation of 1.245. This is so because, majority of the respondents agreed to that. The findings of this study corroborate with findings of the study done by Nyangia & Orodho, (2014) who put cost of remedial classes as one of the issue or factor that leads to school drop out.

Finally, when asked whether high cost of teaching and learning materials leads to boy-child drop-out, 13 (11.1%) respondents strongly disagreed, 7 (6%) respondents disagreed, 3 (2.6%) respondents were neutral, majority of 53 (45.3%) respondents agreed, 36 (30.8%) respondents strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 2.18 with a standard deviation of 1.275. This is so because, majority of the respondents agreed to that.

**Table 3: Class Teacher's Perceptions on Influence of School Factors on Boy-Child Drop-Out Rate**

Statement (delocalization)	SD	D	N	A	SA	Missin g	Mea n	StdD ev
Poor performance in school contributes to school drop dropout.	11 (9.4%)	7 (6%)	5 (4.3%)	45 (38.5%)	48 (41%)	1 (0.9%)	2.03	1.251
Expulsion or suspension of students makes them drop out of school.	7 (6%)	24 (20.5%)	19 (16.2%)	47 (40.2%)	20 (17.1%)	—	2.58	1.169
Student's attitude towards school influence dropout.	2 (1.7%)	12 (10.3%)	16 (13.7%)	54 (46.2%)	28 (23.9%)	5 (4.3%)	2.16	0.982
Long distance to school from home contributes to school dropout.	7 (6%)	31 (26.5%)	18 (13.7%)	40 (34.2%)	21 (17.9%)	—	2.68	1.215
Poor or lack of proper sanitary and toilet facilities impact negatively on the retention rates of boy-students in schools.	16 (13.7%)	35 (26.5%)	13 (11.1%)	33 (28.2%)	18 (15.4%)	2 (1.7%)	2.98	1.338
Inadequate teaching and learning facilities catalyses boy child drop out of school.	20 (17.1%)	27 (23.1%)	20 (17.1%)	32 (27.4%)	16 (13.7%)	2 (1.7%)	3.03	1.334
Hostile teachers anger boys to drop out of school.	10 (8.5%)	29 (24.8%)	23 (19.7%)	37 (31.6%)	17 (14.5%)	1 (0.9%)	2.81	1.215
Harsh school policies affect students' turnover directly and result to involuntary leaving of learners from schools.	31 (26.5%)	56 (47.9%)	11 (9.4%)	12 (10.3%)	7 (6%)	—	3.79	1.128
School practices that inform the students on the need of education encourage boys to complete the school course.	27 (23.1%)	57 (48.7%)	11 (9.4%)	10 (8.5%)	9 (7.7%)	3 (2.6%)	3.73	1.154
Principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduces the chances of drop-outs.	31 (26.5%)	48 (41%)	15 (12.8%)	13 (11.1%)	10 (8.5%)	—	3.66	1.226

Table 3 shows that, 11 (9.4%) respondents strongly disagreed that poor performance in school contributes to school drop dropout, 7 (6%) respondents disagreed, 5 (4.3%) respondents were neutral, 45 (38.5%) respondents agreed, majority of 48 (41%) respondents strongly agreed while 1 (0.9%) respondent did not give his/her views. The mean was 2.03 with a standard deviation of 1.251. This is so because, majority of the respondents strongly agreed to that. The findings of this study are concurrent with the findings of Okpechi, (2014) who insisted that boys should be advised accordingly not to drop out when they perform poorly in academics.

When asked whether expulsion or suspension of students makes them drop out of school, 7 (6%) participants strongly disagreed, 24 (20.5%) participants disagreed, 19 (16.2%) participants were neutral, majority of 47 (40.2%) participants were in agreement and 20 (17.1%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.169, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed to that. As much as indiscipline exists, proper ways to punish a student should be embraced having expulsion and suspension out of equation since it leads to school drop-out (Snilstveit, et. al., 2017).

On whether students' attitude towards school influence dropout, 2 (1.7%) participants strongly disagreed, 12 (10.3%) participants disagreed, 16 (13.7%) participants were neutral, majority of 54 (46.2%) participants agreed, 28 (23.9%) participants strongly agreed while 5 (4.3%) respondents did not give their views on the matter. The mean for this was 2.16 with a standard deviation of 0.982, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed

to that.

Moreover, 7 (6%) respondents strongly disagreed when asked whether long distance to school from home contributes to school dropout. 31 (26.5%) participants disagreed, 18 (13.7%) participants were neutral, majority of 40 (34.2%) participants agreed and 21 (17.9%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 2.68 with a standard deviation of 1.215, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of the study done by Subotzky and Prinsloo, (2011) who asserted that travelling for long to reach school is tedious and therefore schools should be brought nearer to students in order to reduce drop out.

On whether poor or lack of proper sanitary and toilet facilities impact negatively on the retention rates of boy-students in schools, 16 (13.7%) respondents strongly disagreed, majority of 35 (26.5%) participants disagreed, 13 (11.1%) participants were neutral, 33 (28.2%) participants agreed, 18 (15.4%) participants strongly agreed while 2 (1.7%) respondents did not give their views on the matter. The mean for this was 2.98 with a standard deviation of 1.338, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents agreed to that.

When asked whether inadequate teaching and learning facilities catalyses boy child drop out of school, 20 (17.1%) respondents strongly disagreed, 27 (23.1%) participants disagreed, 20 (17.1%) participants were neutral, majority of 32 (27.4%) participants agreed, 16 (13.7%) participants strongly agreed while 2 (1.7%) respondents did not give their views. The mean for this was 3.03 with a standard deviation of 1.334, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents were in agreement to that. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of Tangney (2014) who insisted on adequacy of learning materials.

Moreover, the study sought to find out whether hostile teachers anger boys to drop out of school. 10 (8.5%) respondents strongly disagreed, 29 (24.8%) participants disagreed, 23 (19.7%) participants were neutral, majority of 37 (31.6%) participants agreed, 17 (14.5%) participants strongly agreed while 1 (0.9%) respondent did not give his/her views. The mean for this was 2.81 with a standard deviation of 1.215, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents were in agreement to that.

On whether harsh school policies affect students' turnover directly and result to involuntary leaving of learners from schools, 31 (26.5%) respondents strongly disagreed, majority of 56 (47.9%) participants disagreed, 11 (9.4%) participants were neutral, 12 (10.3%) participants agreed and 7 (6%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 3.79 with a standard deviation of 1.128, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents disagreed to that. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of Snilstveit, et. al., (2017).

When asked whether school practices that inform the students on the need of education encourage boys to complete the school course, 27 (23.1%) respondents strongly disagreed, majority of 57 (48.7%) participants disagreed, 11 (9.4%) participants were neutral, 10 (8.5%) participants agreed and 9 (7.7%) participants strongly agreed while 3 (2.6%) respondents did not give their views on the matter. The mean for this was 3.73 with a standard deviation of 1.154, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents disagreed.

Finally, on whether principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduces the chances of drop-outs, 31 (26.5%) respondents strongly disagreed, majority of 48 (41%) participants disagreed, 15 (12.8%) participants were neutral, 13 (11.1%) participants agreed and 10 (8.5%) participants strongly agreed. The mean for this was 3.66 with a standard deviation of 1.226, this is due to the fact that majority of the respondents disagreed. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of Saliwanchik-Brown, (2009) who highlighted that involvement of students in decision making in school reduces rate of crimes which in turn improves the retention rate.

## 5.1 Conclusion

On how social factors influence boy-child drop-out rate, the study concluded that peer influence and love relationship lead to boy-child drop out from school. Also, the study concluded that parental ignorance and high level of indiscipline of boys contribute to boy child drop-out from school. Also, drug/alcohol abuse is a main factor that leads to boy-child drop-out of school and that family disputes contribute to boy-child school drop-out. Moreover, absenteeism leads to boy-child drop-out of school; however, societal beliefs such as boys are stronger



than girls contribute to emotional mayhem leading to boy-child school dropout are not practical. The study concluded also that, parents' death contributes to boy-child drop out and herding culture meant for boys does not lead to boy-child school drop-out.

On how school factors influence boy-child drop-out rate, the study concluded that poor performance and expulsion and/or suspension of students in school contribute to school drop dropout. Also, students' attitude towards school and distance to school from home influence drop-out. However, poor or lack of proper sanitary and toilet facilities does not impact negatively on the retention rates of boy-students in schools. Furthermore, the study concluded that inadequate teaching and learning facilities and teachers' hostility catalyse boy child drop out of school. School practices that inform the students on the need of education do not encourage boys to complete the school course. Also, principals that involve students in the leadership and decisions reduce the chances of drop-outs as majority of the participants disagreed. It was concluded by the study that affected parents visit school once per term.

On how economic factors influence boy-child drop-out rate, the study concluded that, lack of school fees and desire to contribute to family income generation contribute to boy-child drop-out. Also, boys pursuing menial jobs and low parental income lead to school drop-out. The study also made a conclusion that, big family size does not catalyse boy-child drop-out from school and high cost of secondary education is not a major factor that leads to boy-child drop-out. Furthermore, the study concluded that inheritance of family properties does not contribute to boy-child school drop-out; however, high cost of transport to and from the school contributes to boy-child drop-out from school. Also, high cost of remedial classes and teaching and learning materials contribute to boy-child drop-out from school.

## 5.2 Recommendation

The study recommends the following:

- i) Principals should put in place appropriate methods of discipline administration by use of discipline committees to identify student friendly punishments.
- ii) All schools should identify and ensure teachers offering guidance and counselling services are trained to assist students remain in school.
- iii) The ministry of education to enforce the use of ministry policy guide lines in curbing drop-out in every school.

## References

1. Bacon, M. (2012). *Pragmatism: an introduction*. Polity.
2. Bouris, D., & Schumacher, T. (Eds.). (2017). *the revised European neighbourhood policy: Continuity and change in EU foreign policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Five different approaches*. Thousand Oaks: CA: SAGE
4. Dickson, J. R., Hughes, B. B., & Irfan, M. T. (2016). *Advancing global education*. Routledge.
5. Kenya Institute of Management (2009). *Fundamentals of Management Research Methods*. Nairobi: MacMillan Publishers.
6. Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of educational research*, 86(4), 1272-1311.
7. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.
8. Lelei, M. C., & Weidman, J. C. (2012). Education development in Kenya: Enhancing access and quality. In *Quality and Qualities* (pp. 143-162). Brill.
9. MacMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). Descriptive statistics. *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*, 11(3), 204-236.
10. Mutwol, L. C. (2013). Socio- Economic Factors Influencing Participation and Drop-out of Students in Public Secondary Schools in Marakwet District. Kenyatta University. *Master of Education Thesis*.
11. Nyangia, E. O., & Orodho, A. J. (2014). Cost saving measures in public secondary schools: Are these strategies making education affordable in Kisumu West District, Kisumu County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(18), 76-87.

12. Okpechi, P. A. (2014). The negative effect of child labour on academic performance of secondary school students in central senatorial district of Cross River State-Nigeria. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 13(1), 37-44.
13. Omollo, A. E., &Yambo, J. M. (2017). Influence of peer pressure on secondary school students drop out in Rongo Sub-County, Migori County, Kenya.
14. Rumberger, R. W., &Rotermund, S. (2012). The relationship between engagement and high school dropout. *Handbook of research on student engagement*, 491-513.
15. Sabates, R., Westbrook, J., Akyeampong, K., & Hunt, F. (2010). School dropout: Patterns, causes, changes and policies.
16. Saliwanchik-Brown, C. (2009). From K-GED: Maine teenagers describe social, emotional, and relational factors and conditions involved in their decisions to drop-out and complete with a GED 1188. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences.v4* pg. 35-37
17. Snilstveit, B., Gallagher, E., Phillips, D., Vojtkova, M., Eyers, J., Skaldiou, D., & Davies, P. (2017). PROTOCOL: Interventions for improving learning outcomes and access to education in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 13(1), 1-82.
18. Supaat, D. I., & Denson, R. (2019). Linking women empowerment and children's right to education and the quest to reduce vulnerabilities. *Al-Shajarah*.
19. Symeou, L., Martínez-González, R. A., &Álvarez-Blanco, L. (2012). Dropping out of high school in Cyprus: do parents and the family matter? *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 19(1), 113–131. doi:10.1080/02673843.2012.717899
20. Tangney, S. (2014). Student-centred learning: a humanist perspective. *Teaching in higher Education*, 19(3), 266-275.
21. UNESCO (2015). *School Drop-out: Patterns, Causes, Changes and policies*. Dakar, Senegal. UNESCO