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**ABSTRACT:**

The study was about the factors influencing school dropout in Universal Secondary schools in Kyegegwa District authored by Kemigisa Rosemary, a Head teacher at KIbuye Seconadry school, a masters candidate of Nkumba Universty. The study took place in selected USE schools in Kyegegwa District which lies 197kilometers West of Kampala City in Western Uganda, Rwenzori Region.

The study was guided by the following objectives: To establish the economic factors responsible for school dropout, to investigate the socio-cultural factors responsible for secondary school dropout, to identify the school factors accountable for secondary school dropouts in Kyegegwa District.

The study adopted a survey study design with both qualitative and quantitative approaches, a sample size of 215 respondents was taken and this was purposively and randomly selected.

The study established that 62.6% of the respondents agreed that parents do provide lunch for their children, 68.9% supported the idea that poverty is the most respondents agreed that charging fees in USE schools lead to drop out of school because of child labor. The study also found out that 91.7% of the respondents supported that early marriages / pregnancies, also most respondents i.e. 91.7% showed that corporal punishments contribute heavily to students drop outs. Among school factors 67.7% disagreed that USE schools do not have enough text books; 65% said that USE schools do not have enough furniture classrooms and 73.3% showed that students walk long distances to school, this is because most USE schools lack accommodation for students.

 The study recommends that; The government should focus more resources at secondary school level, the government should also make a realistic policy to readjust the wages of all working people and promote rural economic investment to alleviate rural unemployment and poverty, The Ministry of Education and sports should scrap off cost sharing in USE schools, parents teachers Associations and other stake holders should be strengthened so that they can contribute to the provision of physical facilities of USE schools. The parents should be sensitized on the importance of educating their children. The following further studies are recommended; the factors affecting learners’ satisfaction and achievement in USE schools; the cause of low attitudes towards education among learners in USE schools in Uganda; the causes of gender disparities in school attendance in secondary schools in Uganda. From the study findings, poverty, charging additional fees, child labor, were the most economic factors contributing to school dropout and among the socio-cultural factors the most contributing factors were early pregnancies/ marriages and corporal punishments and among the school factors lack of physical facilities and w
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**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Back ground of the study**

This chapter covers the background which includes the theoretical, historical, conceptual and the contextual perspective upon which the study is anchored, statement of the problem, purpose and objective of the study, the research questions, and significance of the study, limitation of the study and operational definition of terms.

**1.2 Overview**

The back ground of the study is divided into four parts perspectives namely: The historical back ground illuminates the understanding of variables in light of earliest stages and subsequent development (Lawrence, 2004), theoretical back ground highlights the theories that underpin the study, the conceptual back ground details out the meanings of employed concepts/terms and the contextual back ground deals with real research concern.

**1.2.1 Historical back ground**

In 2007, Uganda became the first country in sub Saharan Africa to introduce universal secondary Education coming 10 years after it introduced universal primary education. At the time, a UN report said Africa had the worst secondary school enrolment rates in the world. Only 34% of secondary school age children were enrolled in school. Girls and poorer young people comprised the bulk of those locked out of school by financial and cultural constraints. In its bid to promote economic growth and human development, the government of Uganda in 2007 implemented the Universal Secondary Education (USE), for all children who have successfully completed primary education, for every one of school going age or interested adults. The Ugandan government was committed to USE as reﬂected by the improved budgetary allocations to the education sector. This resulted into an increment in secondary school enrolment from 2.7 million students in 2008 to 5.3 million in 2010 and to 7.l million in 2013, (Bategeka et al., 2013). This suggests that Uganda is on the verge of attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) in as far as access is concerned. However, much as secondary school enrolment has been a success, the concern now is with regard to the internal efficiency of secondary education that is the ability to retain students until they complete secondary school.

According to Dr. Yusuf Nsubuga, director of basic and secondary education at the Ministry of education in 2007, before USE, the secondary scheme barely 50% of primary school leavers went on to secondary education annually. Within a year of the scheme being introduced, the figure rose to 69% similarly, the number of O-level candidates in the country rose from 172,000 in 2006 to almost 265,000 in 2007, an increase of 54%. Nsubuga said the government had increased funding for secondary schooling, which had meant more teachers being recruited, more classrooms and labs being build and more text books. The government policy was to build at least one public secondary school in each sub county, which they are implementing in a three phase system and this financial year (2019/2020), the government is to grant aid 62 secondary schools (New Vision, 24, May, 2019).

Between 2007 (year of inception) and 2008, the sector registered a dropout rate of 2.1 % (both males and females) of the expected 40,654 students. The sector continued to register increasing rates of drop outs; that is 7.2% males and 7.5% females in 2009, 12.5% males and 13.6% girls in 2010, 9.5% males and 10.4% females in 2011 and 11.3% and 14.3% females in 2012 dropped out of USE schools in Uganda (MOES, 2012). Against this above background, the first Cohort of USE completion rate was 74.1% an implication that 25.9% on the first cohort did not complete the USE program, thus this represented wastage of resources.

A recent study by ministry of Education and Sports (2015), found out that, the Universal secondary Education scheme had particularly increased school enrolment for girls from poorer households. The proportion of girls in Kyegegwa district attending public schools increased from 10.6% in 2005 to nearly 85% in 2015. At the same time, the scheme has increased the migration of students from village schools to better performing urban ones, which has resulted in some rural schools barely being able to find enough students.

However, the scheme faces the same difficulties as primary and tertiary education: there may be increased access, but education standards have not improved, something acknowledged in a 2010 overseas Development institute report. Because of inadequate infrastructure schools, classrooms, laboratories, Libraries the government partnered with about 640 private schools. But the system is fraught with problems i.e. inadequate teaching space and materials, a shortage of teachers, and inadequate and late disbursement of government funds. “*Academic performance standards are deteriorating and the education being universal, students are just pushed through*,” Wanyama David a head teacher in one of the USE schools in Eastern Uganda said. Examination results give a hint of this decline. In 2006, nearly 95% of O-level candidates achieved at least the minimum pass rate to qualify for a national certificate in 2007, with 54% increase in candidates, 80% qualified for the certificate.

In another study by Ministry of Education and Sports (2007), the rate of drop out in all government-aided schools for girls and boys was almost equal. The total number of male drop out for 2007 was 164,986, while that of females was l60, 932 giving a national total of 325,918. The Ministry report put forward that, students’ reasons for drop out were 47% said classes were not interesting, 43% missed too many days to catch up, 45% entered high school poorly prepared by their earlier schooling, 69% said they were not motivated to work hard, 35% said they were failing, 32% said they left to get a job, 25% left to become parents while 22% left to take care of a relative. Low family income, misguidance, unconducive school environment are other factors that force students to drop out of school. Teachers could be teaching in a way that is not making the course interesting.

The MFPED (2007), Report that half of the households with children who have dropped out of school cite lack of money as the main problem to pay for lunch and building project funds, to buy uniforms and textbooks” but books and uniform cost more than fees. School dropout face a difficult time in life; they are more likely to be unemployed and impoverished, compared to their colleagues who continued schooling.

According to UNICEF global estimate, ll5 million school age children are out of school. This number is equivalent to 18% of almost one in five of the children worldwide in this age group. Still there are many children who never enter Secondary school, more who will enter late (and over-age), and others will enter and drop out before completing full cycle of secondary schooling regardless of USE existence. This is a result of factors such as policy problems, lack of access to schools, poor quality education, high schooling costs and low returns to education among others which gang up to push children out of USE schools (MFPED 2008). Though one of the targets of the United National Millennium Development Goals was that, all school going age children should be in school by 20l5, through UPE and USE this was not achieved many children continued to dropout regard less of the free education and solving Uganda’s high dropout rates in USE schools was still a problem.

**1.2.2 Theoretical back ground.**

The theories that underpin the study on school dropout are the motivation theories and Expectancy theories.

Students’ motivation for school drives their thoughts and actions to obtain academic success and plays an important role in their efforts to learn, perform, and behave (Ander man & Walters, 2006). Various theories have posited the influence of motivation in shaping students’ school behavior. For example, Tinto (1975, 1993, and 2003) proposed an integration model of attrition that uses students’ interactions with the academic and social systems along with individual characteristics such as educational expectation, values, and other motivational attributes to understand their decision to leave or persist in school. Tinto asserted those students’ educational expectations and view of their own education experiences are important influences on their decision to drop out or persist in school. Students who feel extrinsically and intrinsically rewarded tend to value their education experience, place greater importance on their education, expect to achieve more advanced academic goals, and are more persistent in school.

Prior research indicates that students’ ability beliefs are linked to their educational expectations (e.g., Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara & Pastorelli, 2001; Rottinghaus, Lindley, Green & Borgen, 2002; Tang, Pan& New Meyer, 2008; Trusty, 2000). For example, Bandura et al. (2001) conducted a longitudinal study to examine a structural model of socio cognitive influences that shape students’ educational expectations and career trajectories. Their results revealed that students’ academic expectations were positively linked to their ability belief and were also a key determinant of their preferred choice of career. Trusty (2000) conducted a national investigation of the stability of adolescents’ educational expectations.

Results suggested that ability beliefs positively predict the stability of educational expectations for both female and male subjects. Although less frequently studied, extant research also supports positive relations between intrinsic value and educational expectations. For example, Rottinghaus et al. (2002) examined the role of ability belief School motivation and high school dropout and interest in explaining students’ expectations for their education. They found that students’ interest and ability beliefs both made significant contributions in explaining their educational expectations. Based on both theoretical and empirical evidence from prior research, it seems reasonable to postulate that students’’ ability beliefs and intrinsic values positively predict their educational expectations.

**1.2.3 Conceptual Background**

The key terms of the study includes; school dropout and Universal Secondary Education.

School dropout in education are learners despite having the ability to complete an educational course, fail to do so by either circumstantially or deliberately abandoning school. According To Ephraim Kasozi for Daily Monitor-Wednesday, January 2018; hundreds of African children are forced by poverty to leave school that leads to their exploitation in homes and small businesses. (School dropout is the difference between the number of students enrolled at the beginning of the year and the number of those who remained at the end of the year (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 20l2:l2). In the context of Uganda, drop out is considered to happen whenever student/pupil falls out of the school system before completing full education cycle. Both school and non-school factors contribute to this scenario).

Universal Secondary Education(USE): is a policy in Uganda which was introduction in 2007.That means that any child who passes primary leaving Examination (PLE) with an aggregate score of 28 or less has a right to free secondary Education. In a bid to promote economic growth and human development, the government of Uganda in 2007 implemented the Universal Secondary Education (USE), for all children who have successfully completed primary education, for every one of school going age or interested adults.

**1.2.4 Contextual back ground.**

This research study was conducted in Kyegegwa District found in western Uganda, Rwenzori region. The dropout rate in Kyegegwa district is high especially in USE schools at a rate of 24% compared to private schools which is at 15% (Kyegegwa district Education department Annual Report, 2017)s. According to the District Education Officer, the major causes of school dropout identified in Kyegegwa District include poor attitude towards education by parents, low socio-economic background, parental negligence, walking long distances, and early marriages among other causes. This is because parents are not sensitized on the benefits of educating their children. However, there is no systematic data that tracks the causes of drop out at secondary school level in Kyegegwa District, given the glaring dropout rate of pupils and horrible effects of Secondary school dropout and acts as an inspiration for the researcher to conduct the study aimed at establishing the factors influencing school dropout in Kyegegwa District.

* 1. **Statement of the Problem**

Though Uganda has made enormous efforts in providing education for all in secondary schools through Universal’ Secondary Education (USE), which has resulted into an increase in secondary school enrolment from 2.7 million students in 2008 to 6.3 million in 2017 and to 7.1 million in 2018, (MOES,2018), the level of school dropout remains high. Parents still have to contribute towards school meals, scholastic materials and uniforms making it difficult for many children from poor families to complete their secondary education. Despite government committing itself to providing tuition, teachers, infrastructure and instructional materials to USE/UPPET participating schools, it was observed that there was a big number of students who drop out for different reasons between 2007 (year of inception) and 2008 ,the sector registered dropout rate of 2.1of the students enrolled in USE . The sector continued to register increasing rates of drop outs, that’s to say 7.5. % dropped out in 2009, and 8.2% in 2010, 13.0% in 2011, 9.9% dropped out in 2012 and 25.9% dropped out of USE between 2013 to 2018. Against this back ground, the USE completion rate is 74.1% an implication that 25.9% do not complete the USE (MOES 2018).

Despite the Government’s policy that frees parents and guardians from the burden of paying fees the rate of school dropout is still high in Uganda. This state of affairs in the country’s education system compelled the researcher to conduct a study to establish the factors influencing school dropout in secondary schools in Uganda, with specific reference to Kyegegwa district USE schools.

**1.4 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to establish the factors influencing School dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district-Uganda.

**1.5 Objectives of the study**

The objectives that guided the study stated that:

1. To establish the economic factors responsible for school dropout USE schools in Kyegegwa district.
2. To investigate the socio-cultural factors responsible for USE schools drop outs in Kyegegwa district.
3. To identify the school factors accountable for USE school dropout in Kyegegwa district.

**1.6 Research questions**

1. What economic factors have influenced school dropout in USE schools of Kyegegwa district?
2. What are the socio-cultural factors responsible for school dropout in USEschools of Kyegegwa district?
3. What school factors account for school dropout in Kyegegwa district USE schools?

**1.7 Scope of the Study**

**1.7.1Geographical scope**

The research was carried out from Kyegegwa District, which is located in Western part of Uganda, approximately l97km from Kampala. The research was limited to five schools that are Wekomiire, Bujubuli, Mpara, Hapuuyo Seed, and Kibuye Secondary Schools. The schools were chosen because they are government aided (carrying out Universal Secondary Education program) in Kyegegwa district. All these schools are day schools, normally such schools where children of the poverty stricken peasants go to because of the inability to meet the high costs of boarding schools. Therefore, they portrayed a fair picture on the research problem.

**1.7.2 Content Scope**

The researcher focused on finding out the factors influencing school dropout in secondary schools in Uganda, by identifying the economic, socio-cultural and school factors responsible for school dropout in USE schools Kyegegwa district.

**1.7.3 Time scope**

The study scope covered a period from inception of USE in 2007 to date. The researcher reviewed literature from 2007 to 2019.

**1.8 Significance of the study:**

The study will be of benefit to a number of stake holders that are:

The ministry of education science technology and sports analyze on a wider scale the government and local community relationship and what policies they can put in place to improve the working relations to better USE.

District education officers: The findings will enable the education officers in the district to come up with the best strategies for ensuring that the teachers and the school heads work together to improve educational facilities so as to curb school dropout.

The schools concerned: The schools will use these recommendations to come up with the best mechanisms for improving the quality of the USE in order to make performance become better so as to reduce on school dropout.

Other education institutions: The findings will add enable the other educations & institutions to come up with the best mechanisms for reducing on the rate of drop outs In USE schools.

Body of researchers: The study findings will add to the fragile body of researcher with more existential research findings from which both under graduates and post graduate students as well as project can draw information for reference in their own pieces of work.

The researcher: The study will enable the researchers to obtain the degree of masters of education, planning and management of Nkumba University upon its successful com

**1.9 Justification of the study.**

 Education is key to success for the young people ,and being such as important investment into human capital, not only does education improve individual and family health , but it is also improves the health of the community .The Ugandan government has attempted to solidify education system in place and promotion of values which has led to better political ,social and economic development, thus there is need to ensure that all stakeholders promote education and its values ,and particularly ought to ensure that they provide a descent atmosphere for their children and they take care of, to learn better and acquire the skills for development so as to reduce on drop out in USE school.

**1.10 Conceptual frame work**

 **Independent variable Dependent Variable**

USE School drop out

* Forced dropout
* Involuntary dropout
* Dropout by class
* Dropout by gender
* Dropout by class

**Factors influencing school dropouts.**

* **Economic factors**
* Financial challenges
* Lack of text books and other scholastic materials.
* Child labor.
* Low economic status
* **Socio-cultural factors.**
* Early marriage/pregnancies
* Corporal punishments
* Parent’s perception towards education.
* **School based factors**
* School culture (values , rules)
* School facilities
* Leadership styles
* School environment
* The curriculum
* Constant failures
* Absence of facilities to assist ladies

 during menstrual periods.

*Source: Developed as a model by researcher, 2018*

**1.11 Limitations of the study**

The accomplishment of the objectives of the study was not an easy task. The following were problems encountered in the course of the study.

1. Some respondents were suspicious as to why the researcher wanted the information related to factors influencing school dropout in USE schools. This issue created anxiety to most respondents. However, this limitation was minimized by use of introductory letters by researcher as well as assuring respondents about the use of information they provided for academic purposes.
2. There was also an overlap in advantages and limitations with the methods used for data collection. This relates to the multitude of information generated during the discussion, the additional time required for data collection, the sensitivity of the topic, which limited free expression of views and attitudes and interaction bias which could have affected some of the responses. The researcher tried to minimize these limitations by rephrasing the questions, cross checking the data collected and continuously explaining the purpose of the study and how the findings are for academic purposes.
3. The time was not enough to fully analyze all respondents from interview and questionnaire administration as well as to analyze all the information in journal and other documentary sources /articles. This problem was solved by conducting interviews fast, administering questionnaires fast and getting a good number of relevant documents such as journals and going though them quickly .
4. Some respondents did not return the questionnaires in the time, and some were not be willing to take part in the study. This problem was tackled by use of different data collection methods for examples observation in order to generate more data to come up with good presentation of work.
5. Resources in terms of money were not enough the problem of resources was not solved by using the money sparingly

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.0 Introduction**

This chapter presented the related literature of the study based on the factors inﬂuencing secondary school dropout. The chapter generally contains information obtained from various sources including newspapers, text books, magazines, journals and other records and Medias containing information on school dropout as advanced by earlier scholars and researchers. The literature has been reviewed basing on objectives of the study namely:

**2.1 Economic factors responsible for school dropout in secondary schools**

Poverty interacts with other points of social disadvantage, with the interaction of factors putting further pressure on vulnerable and marginalized children to drop out (Hunt, 2008:52), for example, orphans, migrants, lower caste/scheduled tribe children and children from minority language groups in many, but not all, contexts have disrupted access, and are more prone to drop out. The right of access to essential services in health, nutrition, safe water, shelter, protection and education by the most vulnerable populations remains largely unfilled (UNICEF, 2007: 1). In these physically insecure contexts, it is very difficult for households to make economic investments (Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development -MFPED 2008:18) .Hunt did his study in 2008, UNICEF in 2009, MFPED in 2016, where as such studies were carried out in these years, the current situation is not known.

According to Government Accounting Office (2012), poverty appears to influence the demand for schooling, not only because it affects the inability of households to pay school fees and other costs associated with education, but also because it is associated with opportunity cost of schooling for children. As children grow older, the opportunity cost of education is even larger, hence increasing the pressure for children to work and earn income for the household as opposed to spending time in education. Though many authors have emphasized that poverty is the main cause of school dropout in the developing countries, Universal Secondary Education program seems to have left this concern out due to its cost sharing factor. This is evidenced by (Caillods et al. 2008:l5) that in several countries, USE fees and charges still exist either legally or illegally. They include tuition fees, examination fees, purchase of uniforms and textbooks, game fees, contribution towards school buildings renovation, trips, teacher resource centers, food, among others, of which they are borne by parents, making it difficult for poor children to access education and survive the full cycle Although the authors is saying this, but the case of Kyegegwa District remains unknown.

Colclough et al (2010) describe the links between wealth and school retention in more detail: amongst those out-of-school, the mean wealth index for school drop-outs was generally higher than for those who had enrolled children at school were, on average, from better off households than those who had dropped out, who were, in turn, from richer backgrounds than school-age children who had never enrolled , poor households tend to have lower demand for schooling than richer households: whatever the beneﬁts of schooling, the costs, for them, are more difficult to meet than is the case for richer households (NCES, 2012). Children from poor backgrounds in particular, the pressure on them to withdraw from school increases as they get older, particularly as the opportunity cost of their time increases. Work patterns of household members’ inﬂuences whether income is coming in, and the possible expenditures available. Whereas Colclough did his study in 2010, and National Center for Education Statistics, in 2012, the current situation of Kyegegwa district is not known.

Student-children work to supplement the low household’s income due to poverty. Some children, particularly orphans and heads of households, are forced to work before and after school. Food is often limited, making difficult for children to concentrate. According to Setharamu (2014) cited in Chugh, (2008), if income levels are low, children may be called on to supplement the household’s income, either through wage-earning employment themselves or taking on additional tasks to free up other household members from work. This is more apparent as children get older and the opportunity cost of their time increases. Whereas Setharamu did the same study in primary schools, the current study is in secondary schools is not known.

Poverty is often promoted as a driving factor pushing children to child labor (Blunch & Verner, 2010) and leading to drop out; other studies state it as inability to go to school, as opposed to dropping out of school in order to work. In South Africa, Hunter and May (2006) describe how the depressed job market might act as a deterrent to dropping out, and may encourage children to stay in school longer. A number of researchers indicate that a buoyant job market and the ability to earn good money is a motivating force behind decisions to leave school (Dachi& Garrett, 2008; Duryea, 2009). Duryea (2009) highlights the pull of the labor market (as opposed to’ the push of poverty) as a main factor for children dropping out of school in urban Brazil. Poorer households with fewer physical assets may increase high labor supply, with women and children often called upon (World Bank, 2010). While these coping strategies often attend to short term shocks, the consequences of withdrawing children from school can have longer term implications, because these temporary withdrawals often lead to more permanent drop outs, (Gubert& Robilliard, 2011). Whereas Hunter and May did their study in South Africa, Duryea did his in Brazil, but there is need for a study of Kyegegwa District.

Household income is found to be an important factor in determining access to education as schooling potentially incurs a range of costs, both upfront and hidden. Upfront costs include school fees, while the more hidden costs include uniforms, travel expenses, equipment and the opportunity costs of sending a child to school. Household income is linked to a range of factors: when children start school, how often they attend, whether they have to temporarily withdraw or drop out of school (Croft, 2011:87-88). Another study indicates that withdrawal from school is a last resort for many families (Sogaula et al, 2007; Hunter & May, 2008). Research indicates links with household income, gender and dropping out for example, Fuller and Laing (2009) cited in Grant &Hallman, 2006:6), found an association with a family’s ﬁnancial strength, measured by level of household expenditure and access to credit, and the likelihood a daughter or son will remain in school. Whereas Sogaula did his study in 2007 and Fuller and Laing in 2009, the current situation is not known.

Kadzamira and Rose (2008) indicate that when the cost of schooling is too high for households, it is often girls from poorest households who are less likely to attend. In controversy, Glick and Sahns (2009) indicate that when household income increases, there is greater investment in girls schooling, with no signiﬁcant impact on that of boys. Colclough et al (2010) are keen to point out that while poverty is associated with under-enrolment, ‘the gendered outcomes of such under-enrolment are the product of cultural practice, rather than poverty. Although Kadzamira and Rose did their study in 2008, Cilick and Sahns (2009), the current situation of Kyegegwa District remains unknown

Schooling costs, such as fees and other more indirect costs impact on household decisions to access education. Not only do school fees lead to under-enrollment and drop out, they also limit attendance at school (Mukudi, 2014) and lead to temporally withdrawals. Research indicates students are normally locked out of schools if they cannot pay schooling fees: Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, 2013:18). Therefore, the inability to pay school fees meant children withdrawing from school for periods of time and may end up dropping out of school. The researcher is in line with the current study, but the case of Kyegegwa District is not known.

Children frequently combine household/agricultural duties with some schooling due to poverty, Studies indicate forms of child labor create pressure on a child’s time, for example, children who combine work with school, depending on the nature and volume of work, can have erratic school attendance, regular school absences (Brock and Cammish, 2007: 34) or increased instances of lateness (Guracello et al 2015), while still having educational access, low attendance in particular is seen as a precursor to dropping out. Similarly, agricultural work is often seasonal with clashes with schooling timetables, leading to seasonal withdrawals from school. While still in school, children who are falling behind due to regular absences, temporary withdrawals and heavy out of school workloads, could be members of the silently excluded; those who attend, but fail to engage adequately in teaching and learning processes (Rose &Samarrail, 2007 ). Brock and Cammish did their study in lower years of schooling (primary) but the researcher would like to investigate the case of secondary schools.

In some household contexts child labor is enabling it allows children to gain access to school. Children may earn money, or their work may free-up other household members to go to school. Research from Ethiopia (Rose & Al Samarrai, 2007) showed that because of the tasks they did (i.e. ﬁre wood), boys were better placed to provide income to share the cost of their education than girls, (ILO/IPEC, 2004). However, inter-household child labor was insensitive to changes in the costs of schooling. Meaning that reducing school costs had no effect on the amount of work children had to do within the house hold, (Hazarika and Bedi 2008). Whereas Rose and Al Samarrail did the same study in Ethiopia the current study is in Kyegegwa district Uganda.

In the study of child poverty in different parts of Uganda (Nakanyike et al. 2012), emphasizes lack of investment in education particularly by illiterate parents who do not value education as well as un official charges in USE schools imposed on poor parents to be the major reasons for dropping out of secondary schools.

**2.2 Socio-cultural factors responsible for secondary school dropout**

Socio-cultural factors take into consideration social beliefs of drop out. A study conducted by (Nakanyike 20l2), in different regions of Uganda found that among other factors; lack of school requirements contributed to (32:7%); loss of parents (18.4%) and parents’ inability to provide children with school requirements (14.3%) with the remaining 34.6% of other minor causes.. The study by Holmes (2003), found out that overall; females receive less education than males, and they tend to drop out, or are withdrawn earlier for both economic and social-cultural reasons. The study further argues that the opportunity cost of sending female children to school in rural areas, where girls are married quite early, is high because beneﬁts of their schooling will not accrue to their parental household. Nakanyike carried out her research in many parts of Uganda, the researcher would like to investigate the case of Kyegegwa District.

 Early Marriages: Kasente, (2007) and Kakuru, (2008) explain how early marriages inﬂuences students dropping out of school especially as regards the girl child as it is perceived by parents that marrying off the girl child is an escape route from poverty. Odaga and Heneveld (2015), further note that parents worry about wasting money on the education of girls because there are most likely to get pregnant or married before completing their schooling and that once married, girls become part of another family and the parental investment in them is lost this therefore perpetuates parents discouraging the girl child from continuing with School. Odaga and Heneveld did his study on girls the researcher need to establish the case of boys and girls in Kyegegwa district.

Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment report (UPPAP, 2010) indicates that marrying off girls beneﬁts her family in terms of attaining bride price. Nyanzi (2007) put forward that marriage, pregnancy and sickness are major causes of drop out among girl children while amongst the boys, they include; jobs, lack of interest dismissal and fees. Nyanzi did his in 2008, Uganda participatory poverty Assessment in 2010 these did theirs in these years, the current situation is not known.

Parent’s Education Level. Findings with regard to the impact of parent’s education on schooling of children show that the children of more educated parents are more likely to be enrolled and more likely to progress further through school. Holmes, (2008) shows that this impact differs by gender, the education of the father increases the expected level of school retention of boys, and that of the mother’s enhances the educational attainment of girls, (Lloyd, Mete and Grant, 2009). Similarly other studies by Behnnan et al., (2009) and Swada and Lokshin (2007) reported a consistently positive and signiﬁcant coefficient of father’s and mother’s education at all levels of education. United Nations Children Education Fund (UNICEF, 2009); MOES, (2008); Government of Uganda (GOU, 2009); all demonstrate that Parental decisions do affect children retention. The researcher is in line with the study of Lloyd, Mete and Grant, Holmes (2008), UNICEF 2009, but the case of Kyegegwa district is not known.

Students whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision making and are generally more involved in their schooling are less likely to drop out of school (Astone and McLanalan, 2008,Rumber 2006;Odaga and Heneveld, 2008; and Russel, 2007). Taking into account of the gender dimension of drop outs, UNICEF, (2005) notes that girls are more likely to drop out of school than boys and that students whose mother’s have not attained any level of education will most likely drop out of school.

Bickel and Pagaiannis, (2008) and Rumberger, (2007); cited in Russel, (2003); demonstrate that communities can affect dropout rates by providing employment opportunities during school. Work can contribute to a student dropping out. Student employment begins to correlate with dropping out when the student regularly works over 14 hours per week (Mann 2006, 2009). Other research place the critical level for employment higher, at 20 hours per week (Winters 2006), with the likelihood of dropping out increasing with the number of hours worked. Although the authors are saying this, but the case of Kyegegwa district remains unknown.

Low Social-economic status; Considering the importance of educational attainment to society, the most important determinants of high school dropout are: Low social- economic status which directly correlates with high school dropout; students of parents with lower educational attainment are more likely not to complete high school; Parents who place a low value on a high school education transfer this low value to their children whereby increasing their chances of dropping out of high school; students who have lower Grade Point Average and who have failed more classes poses a higher chance of dropping out of high school. (UNICEF 2015, Vavrus, 20l2), Porteus et al (20l0:l0). The authors did their studies in these years, but the current situation is not known).

Gender based social practices within households, communities and schools: Inﬂuences different patterns of access for girls and boys to education. In most contexts girls have less access and are more prone to dropping out, but increasingly, often in poor and urban environments, the pressure seems to be on boys to withdraw. Within gendered social practices, school safety seems to be an important factor for retaining girls at school, whereas availability of income generating opportunities and ﬂexible seasonal schooling could promote school retention for boys (Colclough et al., 2010; Leach et al. 2008). Uganda Bureau of Statistics, (2014), report found that 9.5% of school dropout in Uganda cited marriage or pregnancy as their reason for leaving school , this was the second highest reason cited for dropping out of school, after cost of schooling. UBOS carried out a study in2014 the researcher needed to establish the current situation of USE schools in Kyegegwa district.

Grade repetition, low achievement, over age enrollers and children; there are often precursors to dropping out, where children could be seen to be at risk or vulnerable to early withdrawal (Hunt, 2008; Lewin, 2008; Ampiah and Adu-Yeboah, 2009). These include grade repetition, low achievement, over age enrollers and children who have regular absences or previous temporary withdrawals from school. It is unclear whether grade repetition increases the chances of completion, but what is apparent is that it extends the age range in a particular grade, and thus increases the possibility of drop out. Teaching to different age groups has different requirements in terms of teaching/learning practices and curriculum (Little, 2008). ‘Yet, in some countries age ranges in a Grade l class might range from 4 to 11 years, and Grade 6 from 10 to 21 years (Lewis, 2007). Children who are over age, due to late enrolment or high grade repetition, limit the number of years children have in school as older children have greater pressures to earn income for the household (EPDC 2009). However the study was carried out in primary schools, there was need for a study in secondary schools,

Illiteracy level of parents; in particular, a mother’s education level often inﬂuences the length of access for girls. For example in rural Pakistan, girls whose mothers have some sort of formal schooling are less likely to drop out from school (Lloyd, Mete and Grant, 2009). There are often precursors to dropping out, where children could be seen to be at risk or vulnerable (Hunt, 2008; Lewis, 2008; Ampiah and Adu-Yeboah, 2009). These include grade repetition, low achievement, over age enrollers and children who have regular absences or previous temporary withdrawals from school. It is unclear whether grade repetition extends the age range in a particular grade, and thus increases the possibility of drop out.

Child migration can be linked to both increased and decreased educational opportunities (Hashim, 2009). For example, children may move into urban areas to access education; but also may migrate to gain paid employment, which may limit educational chances; children living in slum areas or without permanent residence may move frequently, often leaving school as a result (chitins &Suvan, 1984 cited in Chugh, 2014). Migration patterns of communities and labor market expectations may affect demand for schooling and therefore dropping out. Mansuri, (2008) suggests that children in migrant households are more likely to attend and remain in school, accumulating more years of schooling compared to those in non-migrant households. Yet, girls in migrant-households headed by males are still signiﬁcantly more likely to drop out as boys and girls in these households tend to work more. Mansuri’s 2008 paper concludes that migration can also lead to temporary withdrawals from school, while access is gained to other schools. In South Africa the migration process is signiﬁcant as students try to gain access to better quality schooling. These often overcrowded schools can reject applicants, leading to temporary gaps in education as potential students apply elsewhere. Porteus et al (2010) outline the problems of migrants accessing schools in South Africa, with schools requiring documentation, for instance birth certiﬁcate and school transfer forms, which can delay access, and finally leading to drop out.(Mongolia,2008). Where Porteus Mongolia did theirs in South Africa, the case of Kyegegwa district- Uganda is not known.

Data bank reports (2013) revealed that, students are forced out of secondary school due to poor grades or bad behavior. Loss of parent’s makes students to lack of school requirement, loss of parents and parent’s inability to pay, all of which have social and economic dimension. Early pregnancy, chronic illness, poor performance in class, caring for sick relatives, long distance are the main causes of school dropout, (Nakanyike et al., 2012). Therefore, today society needs to stress the importance of education, and by studying the determinants of dropping out of secondary school, society can target the students most inclined to drop out and hopefully improve their chances of economic success in the future by encouraging them to complete secondary school, (Hunter and May 2003:5).

**2.3 School factors accountable for Secondary School dropout**

Raja and Burnett, (2004), states that the major determinants for enrolment in secondary schools include household income, schooling costs, presence of schools, transportation, community involvement, and education quality and relevance and resources allocation; In spite of the general consensus, there is still much disagreement about how to allocate scarce public resources within secondary education sector in a cost effective way (Coady and Parker, 2012). Because of secondary education’s middle position between primary and tertiary levels, its programs have had a functional role: giving students access to higher education, preparing students to lifelong education, and preparing students to work, (World Bank, 2012). In addition to those traditional functions, society is increasingly demanding that secondary education encompass subjects such as the environment, human rights, drug addiction, AIDS, poverty and unemployment, (World Bank, 2012).

The failure by students to ﬁnd positive social relationships in schools and the lack of a climate of caring and support also appear to be related to increased rates of drop out. Positive relationships between teachers and students and among students and a climate of shared purpose and concern have been cited as key elements in schools that hold students until graduation, (Scharff and Brady, 2006). Lack of a conducive study environment also influence students' drop out. The greatest problem faced by day students was home environment that was not conducive to. According to reports by African Almanac (2004) and studies by Holsinger, Jacob and Migimu (2012) Chediel, Sekwao and Kirumba (2010) show that the majority of day secondary schools continued to perform poorly in the national examinations compared to boarding secondary schools. About 65% of schools which were ranked in the top ten in the district from 2005 to 2008 in the National Examinations were boarding secondary schools. Lack of a conduscive study environment makes day student drop out of school. Although Scharff and Brady did their study in 2006, Jacob and Migimu in 2012, the researcher would like to find out the current situation in secondary schools.

Parents working away from home; in China there are 4o million children whose parents are working away from home, their parents’ physical absence, most of those children struggle with their lives especially towards education and personal development (Government of China, 2007). Most parents in China believe that boarding high schools can help students to be fully educated at the same time to be guided in forming and shaping the personal characteristics of the students to become responsible and good to the society. Parents have no time to guide and look after their children, which sometimes discourage continuity of such students in school hence end up dropping out. However, the researcher was in disagreement with this study, that is why she had to establish the case of Uganda and Kyegegwa district in Particular.

Lack of sufficient school facilities; Holsinger, Jacob and Migimu (2012) found out that in Ugandan secondary schools most boarding/day secondary schools had no running water; most of their schools depend on rain water trapped into water reservoirs such as plastic tanks. According to Kitavi and Westhuzan (2007) most secondary schools in Kenya have inadequate supply of clean water, in such secondary schools there are not enough funds to drill boreholes; therefore the schools are forced to share water pump or tank with the local communities. The impact of safe, clean toilets in schools in Africa has been documented. A study by UNICEF (2010) reports that from 2007 to 2010, enrolment rates for girls jumped 17% after improvements in school sanitation, and, the dropout rate among girls fell by even greater percentage. Whereas Kitavi and Westhuzan did their study in Kenya the case of Kyegegwa district-Uganda was not known.

Theft, abuse and harassment of students at school and at home often lead to drop out; A study by Rihani (2007); showed that for female students to feel safe in school environment, it is not only necessary for community to acknowledge a harassment problem but also to set up channels of reporting the incidences. Teachers should be empowered to report such behavior and feel conﬁdent that appropriate action will be taken. A study by Scharff (2007) in Malawi found out that girls were more vulnerable than boys to abuse, both while on the way to school. To avoid lengthy walk to school some girls make their own lodging arrangement near community day schools that do not offer boarding facilities (Brady, 2006). Those self-boarders are unsupervised by the school and are therefore at risk of theft, sexual ‘abuse and prone to drop out of school (Scharff, 2007). Although Scharff conducted his study in Malawi, the case of Kyegewa District Uganda is not known.

School factors play a big role in increasing pressures to drop out such as teacher’s absenteeism, school location and poor quality educational provision. The system of educational provision at the community level generates conditions that can ultimately impact on the likelihood of children to drop out from school.

Failure of the Universal Secondary Education policy is also accountable for school dropout; poor school quality and lack of free secondary education can be directly attributed to failure of USE policy to address these issues at hand and poor planning of USE; while monetary cost, need for children to work in support of their household could have been indirectly addressed if USE took into account the need to meet the costs of USE for children from poor socio-economical backgrounds, (Colclough et al., 2010). The main focus is on the USE policy gaps that contribute to school dropouts. For example, according to (Nakanyike et al, 20l2:60), drop out in USE schools is to a certain extent attributed to the parents, community and schools which focus more on increasing the enrollment in schools while neglecting the efforts to retain them therein. This makes it to seem as though the aim of USE in Uganda is to have big numbers enrolled in schools without minding on their completion (AnangaE, 20l0). . It is this concern that captured the researcher’s interest in the area of USE policy gaps and their contribution to school dropouts since the reality on ground shows low completion rate which contradicts with the main goals of USE program

The second report of participatory poverty assessment (MFPED, 2012); gives broad information about causes of drop outs in USE schools; which it attributes to poor implementation of USE policy. The listed factors include; (i) Long distances from school, children have to wake up very early in order to arrive at school on time and yet lunch at school is not given; (ii) High costs being met by parents as the government does not provide all necessary school requirements such as: school uniforms, scholastic materials, lunch at school, top-up of teacher’s salaries who are not on Government pay roll, building funds and others: (iii) Negative parental attitudes towards USE program as it is assumed to be for the poor and of poor quality. These are some of the gaps in USE program which push disadvantaged children out of school as they are unable to meet all the costs associated with USE and yet the output gained is of poor quality.

Capitation grants/ lower education budgets also influence school dropout; in the education sector, the main budgetary outputs from the government of Uganda secondary education budget are the Secondary teachers’ wage bill, the USE Capitation Bill and the School Facilities Grant (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2013). Teachers’ wages are standard and no supplementation exists for teaching in hard to reach areas. USE capitation grants are paid for on the basis of the number of students enrolled and their level of education (Bategeka and Okurut, 200612); no account for regional education disparities has been taken into account. The School Facilities Grant is meant to buy stationery and furniture and construct classrooms through UPPET project, however due to delays in release of these funds, examinations in some USE schools are written on chalkboard making it had for student to perform well and ﬁnally leading to drop outs.

The Draft Report of the Participatory Poverty Assessment, (2006), gives comprehensive information about causes of drop out combined with absenteeism and lists the following as the key cause of drop out, Seasonal and geographical barriers. For example swamps, ﬂooding during rainy seasons, drought excessive heat during dry seasons and crossing water in island communities like Kalangala district; Peer- ridicule, inadequate special needs facilities and insecurity; Negative student attitudes towards education due to illiteracy, pre -occupation with domestic chores / livelihood activities; Long distances from School, children cannot go back home for lunch. They have to wake up before 5.00 am in order to arrive at school by 8.00 am.

Insufficient learning-teaching materials and resources; In Northern Uganda Schools; and their teaching materials and resources, have been destroyed through looting and the majority of schools are displaced. In the Kitgum district, approximately 86% of schools were displaced and temporarily established in other schools, which results in immense overcrowding and inadequate infrastructure such as classrooms and latrines, This affects the pupil to classroom ratio and teaching effectiveness, Their brief schooling experience consists frequently of limited learning opportunities in overcrowded classrooms with insufficient learning materials and under-quailed teachers (Alexander 2008), this often leads to drop outs in secondary schools. Alexander did his research in Kitgum district, so the researcher wanted to establish the case of Kyegegwa district.

Children of different ages and abilities are mixed together in single classrooms without proper adaptation of teaching methods to improve learning and to induce school engagement (Little, 2008). Such schooling circumstances, together with personal and family level factors such as ill- health, malnutrition and poverty, jeopardize meaningful access to education for many children. As a result, many children are registered in schools but fail to attend, participate but fail to learn, are enrolled for several years but fail to progress and end up dropping out from school. Teachers are also attracted to work for humanitarian agencies in Uganda, where salaries are higher and working conditions and allowances are more generous. High rates of teacher absenteeism reﬂects the challenge faced by teachers; many schools lack teacher housing, forcing teachers to walk long distances often along insecure routes; salaries are low and without hardship allowances; (this affects learners performance in class and students are often traumatized and former LRA soldiers (Women’s commission for Refugee Women and Children, 2015: 8). This research (study) was done in Northern Uganda so the case of Kyegegwa district in western Uganda was not known.

**2.5 Conclusion.**

There is no single prominent factor that inﬂuences school dropout. These factors fall into four broad categories related to individuals (for instance, truancy, poor school attitude), families (like, low-income, lack of parental involvement), schools (such as, negative school climate, low expectations), and communities (like, high crime, lack of community support for schools). Dropout rates particularly correlate with high poverty rates, poor school attendance, poor academic performance, grade repetition (that is, being held back), and disengagement from school. High school dropping out severely limits the chances of future success and continues the cycle of poverty into future generations. Receiving a good education is the lifeline by which many youth can lift themselves out of poverty.

Facing the high school dropout dilemma will require commitment and investment in high quality early childhood education, attention to social and emotional learning, continual monitoring of student attendance and academic progress, intensive instruction for slow learners, using alternatives to school push-out, fostering of a positive school climate, and engagement with parents, families, and communities. Despite the positive strides undertaken by earlier scholars in assessing the factors inﬂuencing school dropout in secondary schools, more is research was still required to examine other factors escalating continuous drop out in secondary schools in Uganda in particular Kyegegwa District.

**CHAPTER THREE**:

**METHODOLOGY**

**3.0 Introduction**

This chapter presented a description of the various sub sections that constitute the methodology of the study that would be adopted by the researcher in executing the study along with the justification behind them (Amin, 2009). It contains the research design, population of the study, determination of the sample size, sampling techniques and procedure, data collection methods, data collection instruments, pretesting (validity and reliability), procedure of data collection, data analysis, measurement of variables, ethical considerations and limitations of the study.

**3.1 Research design**

A descriptive cross sectional survey research design was adopted with both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Amin (2009) explains that a descriptive cross-sectional survey research design is a research plan that is concerned with systematic description of items being studied. This study was cross-sectional because the researcher picked a cross-section of correspondents over short period of time and follow up of the respondents was not necessary. A survey was chosen because it allowed the researcher to get a detailed description of the factors influencing school dropout in universal secondary school in Kyegegwa District.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to collect, present and interpret data as a way of enhancing the quality of the findings of the study. The study relied more opinions, backed by figures; it used more of qualitative approach, and importantly quantitative data up the narratives. Amin (2005) opines that *“results from the method can help develop or inform the method or one method can be nested within another method to provide insight into different level of analysis”.* Therefore, by using both qualitative and quantitative research paradigms the researcher attained methodological triangulation that helped enhance the validity and reliability of the study.

The qualitative approach was employed during the collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation of numerical data while the quantitative approach was used in the collection analysis, interpret, interpretation and presentation of numerical data.

**3.2 Target Sample Study Population/ Determination of the sample size:**

The size was selected basing on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table of sample size determination. The target population for the study consisted of members of Board of Governors (BOG), head teachers and their deputies, teachers and students selected in five selected Universal secondary schools of Hapuuyo, Wekomiire, Bujubuli, Mpara and Kibuye in Kyegegwa district as well as selected number of parents and school dropout. These were the people the researcher believed to be having good information about factors influencing school dropout in Kyegegwa District.

**Table 3.1 showing the study population**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **First Category**  | **Sampling Techniques**  | **Sampling Size** |
| Board of Governors  | Purposive random sampling  | 20 |
| Head teachers and their deputies | Purposive sampling  | 10 |
| Teachers | Simple random sampling |  50 |
| Students | Simple random sampling | 75 |
| Subtotal |  | 155 |
| **Second Category** | **Sampling Techniques**  | **Sample Size** |
| Parents of school dropout | Purposive sampling | 30  |
| School dropout  | Purposive sampling  | 30 |
| Total category 1 and 2 |  |  215 |

***Source: Extract by researcher 2019***

In the above table, 20 members of the Board of Governors were selected by Purposively random sampling i.e. the Board Chair Person, two PTA representatives and one OB/OG representative because of financial constraints involved in the data collection and these were thought to be having much knowledge about dropout, a total of 10 head teachers and their deputies were purposively sampled this is because they had adequate information about why students drop out from their schools, 50 senior teachers were simple random sampled because this saved time and funds for printing questionnaires and most of who seemed to be familiar with the factors influencing school dropout in USE schools ; also 75 students we are sampled by simple random sampling because of financial constraints; only 30 parents of the dropout and 30 school dropout were purposively sampled so as to get the actual picture about why students drop out because they were the really affected people. Five (5) USE schools were selected out of the 7 school in Kyegegwa district due to high costs incurred during the research process. These schools were selected because they have in existence since the inception of USE in 2007.

**3.3 Sampling Techniques and Procedures**

The researcher employed several sampling techniques in recruiting respondents in the study, the first of groups of respondents include (head teachers and members of the Board of Governors, teachers, students) while the other respondents were the parents and the school dropout. The Board of Governors were recruited using purposive sampling so as to save time, the head teachers and their deputies we are recruited using purposive sampling, given their usual interaction with the parents and students while teachers were chosen through simple random sampling given the huge number of teachers with in USE schools and on the second category (parents and school dropout) were recruited using purposive sampling given that there was need to recruit those who could read and write. Only five USE schools where selected in the district due to the high cost incurred during the research process so this quote minimize on the coasts of this study

**3.4 Data collection methods**

Data was collected from both secondary and primary sources.

**3.4.1 Observation Method**

Through the observation method there is such directly observed and collected information on school environment, conditions of classrooms and provision of meals at School. This method helped her to collect data in its current form and did not require the active co-operation of the respondents. This helped the researcher to obtain first-hand information about students’ welfare, classroom environment, in contrast to information that would be provided by the respondents in the questionnaires which may be biased and inaccurate. Through observation method, the researcher was in position to obtain additional unexpected but useful information which helped her to formulate her own version of what was occurring in reference to factors influencing School dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district independent of the respondents (Amin 2009).

 **3.4.2 Questionnaire Method**

The researcher prepared questionnaires containing several questions concerning the objectives of the study and gave them to the respondents who wrote down the answers in the spaces provided in the questionnaire itself because this made it more economical and convenient (Amin, 2009). There were 4 sets of questionnaires; the first question was always responded by the members of the board of Governors, head teachers with their deputies. The second questionnaire was responded by the teachers and the third was responded by the students and the last one by school dropout.

**3.4.3 Interview method**

With the help of the interview guide, the researcher conducted face-to-face interviews to a few selected individuals (head teachers and parents) who were used to collect more elaborative data about the factors influencing school dropout in USE schools that were not collected by using questionnaires.

**3.5 Data Collection Instruments**

The main data collection instruments in this study were observation checklists, interview guides and questionnaires. The researcher used these three types of instruments for the purpose of triangulation and they were developed on the basis of the study objectives and the conceptual frame work.

**3.5.1. Observation Checklist**

An observation checklist is a systematic design schedule or form containing what the researcher would like to observe during the study in terms in terms of numbers, sizes and their conditions (Amin 2009). Observation checklist helped the researcher to collect data directly seen on the factors influencing school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district for example learners were observed during lunch, class room environment, the nature of punishments subjected to learners and this helped the researcher minimize deliberate respondent information falsification and get first hand information (Amin 2009).

**3.5.2 Questionnaires**

Questionnaires were used because they allowed the confidentiality, collection of a lot of data in a short time with a large number of respondents of respondents who were geographically apart. Questionnaires do not call for close supervision; they are cheap and can allow respondents to fill them at a time convenient to them (Koul, 2009). Parents, teachers, head teachers and their deputies, board of Governors responded to Questionnaires. Four sets of Questionnaires were designed, one for head teachers and their deputies and board of Governors, the second one for teachers, the third one for students and the last one for school dropout.

**3.5.3 Documentary Review checklist**

Documentary review checklist as a secondary data collection instrument was used to collect data. The researcher collected obtained secondary data from various sources. This includes published data un-published data. Published data were got from publications of government such as ministry of Education publications, Board of Governors minutes, school meeting minutes, head teachers reports, class attendance registers, class teachers reports and Uganda national examination board registration (UNEB) records on UCE and UACE.

**3.5.4 Interview guides**

Interview guides were designed to help the researcher conduct face to face interviews to a few selected individuals (head teachers and parents). It was used to collect elaborative data that would not be collected using questionnaires.

**3.6 Pre-testing validity and reliability**

**3.6.1 Validity**

Mazaki (2009) echoes LoBiondo-wood & Haber (2002) by referring to validity as the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and whether it measure it accurately.

To ensure validity, the instrument covered all the dimensions of the phenomenon under study. The questionnaires were discussed with colleagues and the supervisor to assess their structure, content, clarity, consistency and relevancy in relation to the research objectives and the study was carried out in a natural setting of USE schools.

The level of accuracy the instruments for social determinant computation of content validity index (CVI) an indicator of the level of accuracy of the instrument. The inter-judge co-efficient of validity was applied for each item in the instrument (number of judges declared instrument valid) / (total number of judges) and an average was computed for the overall instrument (Amin, 2005). The formula by (Amin, 2005) was applied; CVI = (number of items declared valid / total number of items, the researcher obtained CVI = 0.76 which is acceptable. After Computing the CIV as a way of determining the level of accuracy the researcher interpreted the CVI as a way of determining the level of accuracy of the instrument, the researcher interpreted CVI on the basis of George and Malley (2003) rule

1. 1-0.9 = Excellent
2. 0.8 - 0.98 = Questionnaires
3. 0.70-0.79 = Acceptable
4. 0.60-.69 = Questionable
5. 0.50-0.59 = Poor
6. 00-0.5 = Unacceptable

The questionnaires were given to two expert researchers (supervisors), to rate the validity of the items there in and content validity index (C.V.I) was computed by dividing the total number of valid items by the items in a questionnaire.

The researcher also used triangulation, which was more than one multiple data collection method, was used to enhance the quality of the findings (Amin, 2005).

**3.6.2 Reliability**

Amin (2005) opines that reliability as the extent to which an instrument consistently measures whatever it is measuring. Mugenda (2003) consider reliability as the extent to which the research tool gives consistent results after repeated trials. To ensure reliability the researcher constructed a questionnaire with appropriate wording, simple direct and familiar words to the respondents. Items in the questionnaire and interview guide that were double barrelled, leading and based on assumptions were avoided and schools and respondents were selected without bias. The research tools were pre-tested in Pilot study in one of the schools that was selected for the study but within a similar environment to the schools participating in the study to determine clarity of items in the questionnaire and effectiveness of instructions.

The level of consistency was then computed through reliability coefficient which ranged between 0 and 1, and results were interpreted on the basis of George and Malley (2003) scale and if necessary, adjustments, were made on the questionnaires from the piloting study. After piloting the Total instrumental, the items we are divided into two comparable subsets; all odd items in one half and all the even items were in the other half. Computation of each group’s score were on two halves since each group ended up with a score for the odd items and a score for the even items and then two sets of scores were correlated. The researcher obtained V as 0.8 which was high.

**3.6 Procedure of data collection**

The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the school of Education Humanities and Sciences of Nkumba University which introduced her and her research assistants to the relevant authorities in the selected USE schools in the area. The researcher appointed two research assistant trained them and used them to collect data from secondary schools. She also visited these schools to interview head teachers and parents in the neigh boring community.

After constructing questionnaires, the researcher wrote an accompanying letter that assured the respondents that any information they gave was to be kept confidential and used for academic purposes only. A good relationship with the respondents, the researcher and her assistants was established. They were informed about the purpose of the study and guided on how to fill out questionnaires. Appointments were made with head teachers on when to conduct the interview during the month of April 2019.

**3.8 Data analysis**

Data analysis is the process of examining what has been collected in a survey and making deductions and differences. It involves scrutinizing the acquired information and searching for patterns of relationships that exist among the groups (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The researcher employed both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms in data analysis for purposes of methodological triangulation in order to enhance the validity and reliability of the study (Amin, 2005).

**3.8.1 Quantitative Data**

Data collected from the field examined for its accuracy and completeness of information given. It was edited, sorted, tabulated, corded expressed in percentage and analyzed to ensure accuracy and completeness. Frequencies and percentages were used because they could easily communicate to the research findings the majority of the readers. Frequencies could easily show the number of times a response occurred and the number of respondents in a given category while percentage informed the comparison of the subgroups that differ in size and proportion (Gay, 1992). The mean and standard deviation well computed data processing evolved three stages editing, coding and tabulating

Editing; the information was edited for completeness, accuracy, uniformity and consistency responses where checked by eliminate errors arising from commissions and mistakes in recording or making.

Tabulation; tabulation was done to give a clear presentation of various responses and significance of each interpretation.

**3.8.2 Qualitative data**

Qualitative data analysis for standby narrative as shall be recorded during face-to-face interview and through observation. The researcher used a quick impressionist summary in analyzing qualitative data; she summarized key findings by noting down the frequent responses of the respondents during the interview on various issues concerning the economic social culture and School factors influencing school dropout Universal secondary education. This technique of qualitative data analysis was chosen because it saved time and it was not very expensive. Interviewees were listened to attentively in order to identify emerging themes and through sorting, recording reflection and interpretation of the meaning of data Amin 2005, Tromp 2006 Souza 2009, Nsubuga 2008).

**3.9 Ethical considerations.**

During the planning, collection and processing of data, the researcher followed a number of research guidelines to maintain ethical standards which include: Seeking informed consent of the respondents and making it known that their participation is voluntary and they are free to withdraw from the study at any time or may not answer question they are uncomfortable with.

The researcher accorded due to respect to the respondents’ privacy and confidential treatment so that the names of the participants and their schools cannot be identified, the respondents remained anonymous.

The researcher got permission from MOES to gain access to selected secondary schools and this was followed by officially writing to the head teacher requesting them to allow the researcher to conduct the study (Amin 2005, Nsubuga, 2008).

The researcher was objective in conducting the research process to avoid bias, by for example employing research assistants to collect data. The researcher also displayed high level of confidentiality with data collected from the respondents and with obtained consent from them before administering data collection instructions.

The researcher assured the respondents that she is seeking data from them for research purposes alone and the data was used for academic purposes alone.

In this ways, the researcher did not demand for their identity, and assured them of how the information they give was not be used for any other purposes other than research.

The researcher informed the respondents the purpose of the study, why and how they would be selected.

The research went ahead to seek for informed consent of each respondent both orally and in writing.

The researcher tried as much as possible to minimize embarrassing questions especially during interview in order to obtain the best results, the research tried as much as possible to avoid perceptual biases during questionnaire administration and interviews.

The above ethical considerations were vital in ensuring that respondents do not with hold desired information and ensure that the data collection reflected a true and fair image of the views of the respondents

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION:**

* 1. **Respondents personal variables**

This section presents the respondents personal variables of students, teachers, and head teachers with their deputies and Board of Governors members totaling to 155.

* + 1. **Gender of the respondents**

The study sought to find out the gender of the respondents and the findings are presented in Figure 4.1.

 **Figure 4.1 showing the gender of the Respondents.**

Source: primary data

Figure 4.1 show that majority 56% of the respondents were female while 44% were male. The difference in sex of respondents implies that both sexes provided vital data in the study. This helped the researcher gather more objective information.

* + 1. **Age bracket of the respondents.**

The researcher sought to find at the age bracket of the respondents and the findings are presented in the table 4.2;

**Table 4.1 age bracket of the respondents.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age bracket  | Frequency  | Percentage  |
| Below 20 years 21- 30 31- 40 41 – 50 51 – 60 Above 60 years Total  | 45 324023105155 | 29.0 20.625.814.83.36.5100 |

 Source: primary data

Table 4.1 shows that 29% of the respondents were below the ages of 20 years, 20.6% between the ages of 21-30, 25.8% were between years, 14.8% of the respondents were between 41-50 years, 3.3% of the respondents were between 51-60 years and 6.5% were above 60 years. This implies that all ages of the respondents were represented, and it again shows that the majority of the respondents were adults in the active working age categories, who probably had adequate knowledge for the study due to the fact that they were mature enough to provide relevant and reliable information on the factors influencing school dropout in universal secondary schools of Kyegegwa district.

* + 1. **Period in school / length of service.**

The study sought to find out the length of service in the education system and the period in school in case of students and the findings are presented in table 4.2 and figure 4.2 below.

**Table 4.2 showing the length of service / period in school**.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Period in school / length of service  | Frequencies  | Percentage  |
| 1 year or less 2-3years 4-6years Above 6 years  | 28 406027  | 18.1 25.838.717.4  |
| Total  | 155 | 100 |

Source: Primary data.

On the length of service in the education 18.1% of the respondent had been in the school for a period less than a year, 25.8% had spent 2-3 years in school, 38.7% had been in school / had served for 4-6 years while 17.4% had been in school for more than 6 years. Therefore were familiar with the factors influencing school dropout in universal secondary school in Kyegegwa district: so they were able to give reliable information for the study.

* + 1. **Level of Education:**

The study sought to find out the highest level of education and the findings are presented in figure 4.2 below.

**Figure 4.2: Showing the level of Education**

Source: primary data

On the highest level of Education; attained by respondents, 40% were in secondary Education (school) 10% had certificates, 35% had diploma, 13% had bachelors and 3% had masters. The findings above show that majority of the respondents were literate enough to support the study by providing valuable information about school dropout in universal secondary schools.

* + 1. **Type of school.**

The study sought to find out the type of school where the respondents were attending or working from as illustrated below in table 4.3 and figure 4.3;

**Table 4.3 showing the type of school.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of school  | Frequency  | Percentage  |
| USE school  | 125 | 80.7 |
| Non USE school | 30 | 19.3 |
| Total  | 155 | 100 |

 Source: Primary data.

 **Figure 4.3 showing the schools attended by respondents;**

From the table 4.3 and Figure 4.3 above, 80.7% of the respondents were from universal secondary schools while 19.3% were from non-universal secondary schools. This implies that the findings provided a clear picture of factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District.

* + 1. **Type of employment / occupation of the respondents**

The study sought to find out the occupation of the respondents involved the research study.

 **Table 4.4: Showing the occupation of the respondents.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of employment  | Frequency  | Percentage  |
| Peasant  | 20 | 12.8  |
| Self employed  | 10 | 6.5  |
| Government employed  | 75  | 48.4  |
| Privately employed  | 50 | 32.3  |
| Total  | 155 | 100 |

Source: Primary data

Table 4.4 indicates that 48.4% were government employed, 32.4% were privately employed, 12.8% were peasants and 6.5% were self-employed. This shows that 80.8% of the respondents were actively employed in active service so that were aware of the factors influencing school dropout in Kyegegwa District.

* + 1. **Orphanage status of the respondents**

This question was entirely for students and the researcher sought to investigate the orphanage status of the students in relation to school dropout as illustrated below:

* + 1. **Type of employment of the respondents**

The researchers ought to find out the employment category of the respondents’

Type of employment and this research question targeted head teachers, deputies and teachers in USE schools as illustrated in table 4.5 and figure 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5 showing the type of employment of the respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of employment** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Permanent | 21 | 35% |
| Contract |  09 | 15% |
| Temporally | 30 | 50% |
| Total | 60 | 100% |

Source: Primary data

These research findings can as well be illustrated and elaborated more using the figure below:

**Figure 4.5 showing the type of employments of the respondents**

Source: Primary data

* 1. **ECONOMIC FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUT IN UNIVERSAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS.**

In this section, the study presents and discusses the economic factors responsible for school dropout in universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa district. In a bid to establish, the findings to this objective of the study, the researcher administered research tools whose findings are presented, interpreted and analyzed in section 4.2 as below:-

* + 1. **Whether parents do provide enough scholastic materials to their children.**

The study sought to find out whether parents do provide their children with scholastic materials like books, pens; the findings are presented in table 4.6.

**Table 4.6 showing whether parents do provide their children with enough scholastic materials.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RESPONSE  | FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS | TOTALFrequency | Percentage |
|  | H/teacher & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 09 | 23 | 02 | 35 | 22.6 |
| Agree  | 05 | 05 | 42 | 10 | 62 | 40 |
| Disagree  | 03 | 30 | 07 | 06 | 46 | 29.1 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 01 | 02 | 02 | 06 | 3.9 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 05 | 01 | 00 | 06 | 3.9 |
| Total |  | 155 | 100 |

 Source: primary data.

On whether parents do provide enough scholastic materials to their children, table 4.6 indicates that a cumulative majority 62.6% of the respondents agreed that most parents do provide enough scholastic materials o their children, 33.5% disagreed, while 3.9% were not sure.

From the Head teacher’s report in Kakabara SS, she said that few parents do provide their children with enough scholastic materials, as you find majority of children without pens, books, calculators, rulers among others. This makes the work of teachers very difficult.

* + 1. **Whether most students do have lunch at school.**

The researcher sought to find out whether most students have lunch at school in USE schools and the findings are presented in table 4.7 below;

**Table 4.7 showing whether students do have lunch at school:-**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RESPONSE  | RESPONDENTS CATEGORIES. | TotalFrequency | Percentage |
|  | H/teachers & Deputies | Teachers | Students  | BOG |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 06 | 07 | 02 | 16 | 10.3 |
| Agree  | 02 | 12 | 18 | 03 | 35 | 22.6 |
| Disagree  | 06 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 53 | 34.2 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 11 | 32 | 04 | 48 | 31.0 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 00 | 01 | 03 | 1.9 |
| **Totals**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data.

Table 4.7 above indicates that a cumulative majority of 65.2% of the respondents disagreed that students do have lunch at school, 32.9% agreed and while 1.9% of the respondents were not sure. The majority 65.2% implies that parents claimed that the government has to feed the children at school and the lack of awareness of their role in terms of feeding their children at school, therefore there is more need for the government to further sensitize these parents on their role of providing meals (lunch) to their children at school and on the contribution of the meals to the academic performance of their children and hence reducing on school dropout.

* + 1. **Poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout.**

The researcher sought to establish whether poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout in Kyegegwa district USE schools.

**Table 4.8 showing whether poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 02 | 25 | 32 | 04 | 63 | 40. |
| Agree  | 05 | 15 | 14 | 10 | 44 | 28.3 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 10 | 13 | 04 | 29 | 18.8 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 00 | 11 | 02 | 14 | 9.1 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 05 | 00 | 05 | 3.2 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

Table 4.8 indicates a cumulative majority of 68.9% of respondents agreed that poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout in universal secondary schools, 27.9% disagreed, that poverty is not the most contributing factor to school dropout. This could be attributed to high costs of schooling that is other additional school charges in terms of lunch fees, PTA contribution, among others which parents may not afford. The majority of 68.9%, this corresponds to the study by Kadzamira and Rose (2008) who revealed that when the cost of schooling is too high for households, it is often girls from poorest households who are likely to drop out of school because of poverty.

* + 1. **Whether low economic status has contributed to school dropout.**

The researcher sought to find out whether low economic status contributes to school dropout.

**Table 4.9 showing whether low economic status contribute to school dropout.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS**  | **TOTAL****Frequency** |  **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers | Students | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 04 | 15 | 16 | 08 | 43 | 27.8 |
| Agree  | 03 | 14 | 27 | 09 | 53 | 34.2 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 06 | 15 | 01 | 23 | 14.8 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 05 | 05 | 02 | 13 | 8.4 |
| Not sure  | 01 | 10 | 12 | 00 | 23 | 14.8 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data

On whether low economic status contributes to school dropout, a cumulative majority of 61.9% agreed that low economic status contribute to school dropout, 23.2% disagreed and 14.8% were not sure. The majority of 61.9% showed that if the status of parents/guardians is poor economically, the students are likely to drop out of school. This finding is in agreement with Setharamu (2014) cited in Chugh (2008) who stated that, if the income levels are low, children may be called on to supplement the household’s income either through wage earning employment themselves or taking on additional tasks to free up other household members from work. This is more apparent as children get older and the opportunity cost of their time increases. In all spheres of learning, there is a positive relationship between low economic status and students dropping out of school in USE schools.

* + 1. **Whether charging additional fees at school influence school dropout.**

The study sought to establish whether charging fees influences students drop out in USE schools in Kyegegwa district.

**Table 4.10 showing whether charging fees contribute to school dropout.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS**  | **TOTAL Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers | Students | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 06 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 56 | 36.1 |
| Agree  | 02 | 27 | 28 | 05 | 62 | 40.0 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 02 | 13 | 02 | 19 | 12.3 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 02 | 07 | 00 | 09 | 5.8 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 07 | 00 | 09 | 5.8 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data

On whether charging fees at school influence school dropout, in table 4.10 above a cumulative 66.1% agreed that charging for fees at school influence school dropout, 12.3% disagreed and 5.8 strongly disagreed. This is because most universal secondary schools do charge additional fees to USE students. These findings also agree with Makudi (2004) who explained that schooling costs such as fees and other indirect costs impact on household decisions to access, he further asserts that not only do school fees lead to under enrolment and drop out but also limit attendance and lead to temporally withdraw. These finds are also in time with the research by Obasi (2010), World Bank report (2012), which indicates students are locked out of schools if they cannot pay school fees.

* + 1. **Students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like Agricultural activities.**

This study sought to find out whether students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like agricultural activities, trading, riding boda boda, etc. as presented in table 4.10.

**Table 4.11 showing whether students drop out of USE schools to involve in economic activities.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS**  | **TOTAL****Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers | Students | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 06 | 16 | 03 | 26 | 16.8 |
| Agree  | 06 | 28 | 27 | 09 | 70 | 45.2 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 07 | 15 | 07 | 31 | 20 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 08 | 05 | 01 | 15 | 9.7 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 01 | 12 | 00 | 13 | 8.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data

On whether students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities in table 4.11 above, 45.2% of respondents agreed, while 16.8% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed, 9.7% strongly disagreed, and 8.3% were not sure. From the findings above, it shows that students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities. This findings is agreement with Rose and Samarral (2007) indicated that agricultural work often makes students to drop out of school this because it seasonal and clashes with schooling time tables leading to seasonal with draws and even drop out of school.

* + 1. **Poor prices for crops influence drop outs.**

The researcher sought to find out whether poor prices of crops influence drop outs and the findings are presented in table 4.12 below;

**Table 4.12 showing whether poor prices for crops influence students dropping out in USE schools.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS**  | **Total** **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers | Students | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 05 | 12 | 10 | 05 | 32 | 20.7 |
| Agree  | 04 | 19 | 16 | 08 | 47 | 30.3 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 09 | 17 | 07 | 34 | 21.9 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 08 | 30 | 00 | 38 | 24.5 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 02 | 00 | 04 | 2.6 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data

On whether poor prices of crops influence students to drop out of USE schools, from table 4.2.7 above 51% agreed, 46.4% disagreed, and 2.6% were not sure. This implies that dropping out of school is not majorly influenced by poor prices of crops. Because a cumulative percentage of 46.4% disagreed that poor prices do not influence drop outs, and a total percentage of 51% agreed. However this number through high but it shows that dropping out of school is not majorly by poor prices.

* + 1. **Whether students’ drop out of school because of child labor.**

This study sought to find out whether students drop out of school because of child labor.

**Table 4.13 showing whether students drop out of school because of child labor.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS**  | **Total** **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers | Students | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 06 | 17 | 21 | 13 | 57 | 36.8 |
| Agree  | 03 | 29 | 27 | 04 | 63 | 40.6 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 02 | 13 | 02 | 18 | 11.6 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 01 | 05 | 01 | 07 | 4.5 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 01 | 09 | 00 | 10 | 6.5 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: primary data

Table 4.13 shows that majority 77.4% of the respondents agreed that students drop out of school because of child labor, 11.6% disagreed, 4.5% strongly disagreed, 6.5% were not sure. The majority 77.4% agrees with ILO/IPEC (2014) who revealed that most children especially girls drop out of school because of child labor.

* + 1. **Responses from school dropout and their parents.**

On economic factors responsible for school dropout the researcher carried out an interview on school dropout and parents and the following were the findings as illustrated below;

**Figure 4.6 showing the responses from school dropout and their parents:**

Source: Primary data

According to the Figure 4.6 above, revealed that 45% dropped out of school because of lack of school fees, 31% dropped out because out because of child labor, 15% of the respondents said that it was they were not taking lunch at school, 10% said it was due to lack of scholastic materials, 6% dropped out so as to involve in other economic activities, 2% was because low economic status and only 1% said it was due to poor prices of crops.

Bagonza Francis a drop out from Wekomiire SS narrates that he dropped out of school because his mother a bread winner at home could not afford to continue paying for him in S.5 because she had young ones to look at. When asked whether he can go back, he said he cannot go back because had started on job training of brick laying and concrete practice.

Also another drop out called Panama Tumusiime who dropped out of school in S.3 from Humura SS also narrates that he dropped out of school because of fees charges in form of PTA project fund; his parents could not afford paying it in time, so he decided to leave school.

 Interviews with key informants revealed that the number of students who had joined S.1 in 2014 had declined by 45% by the time they completed S.4 in 2018. And also the number of students who joined senior six this year (2019) had declined by 32% in comparison to those who were enrolled in senior five in 2018.

The interview with the school administration revealed that, high level of secondary school dropout in Kyegegwa district was as a result of; Low income among parents, Starvation of students without lunch. students failure to pay school fees and building funds, it is expensive to buy school uniforms and lack of reading materials such as textbooks, children prefer engaging in income generating activities, and gambling because of poverty. So the revealed that dropout rate was high in Kyegegwa District and poverty was the major contributing factor.

* + 1. **Mean and Standard deviation of economic factors responsible for school dropout**

The researcher sought to find out the mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ views in the research study on economic factors responsible for school dropout.

**Table 4.14 mean and standard deviation of the economic factors responsible for school dropout in universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa district.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables  | N | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Parents do provide enough scholastic materials  | 155 |  2.26 | 0.98 |
| Most students do have lunch at school | 155 | 2.92 | 1.01 |
| Poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout | 155 | 2.06 | 1.11 |
| Low economic status contribute to school dropout | 155 | 2.48 | 1.37 |
| Charging fees influence school dropout | 155 | 2.05 | 1.11 |
| Students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like agricultural activities | 155 | 2.48 | 1.13 |
| Poor prices for crops influence school dropout | 155 | 2.58 | 1.14 |
| Students drop out of school because of child labor | 155 | 2.03 | 1.11 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 155 |  |  |

Source: primary data

On the economic factors responsible for school dropout in universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa district.

The results in table 4.14 shows a moderate agreement of respondents on whether parents do provide their children with enough scholastic materials with a mean (M = 2.26) and standard deviation of (SD = 0.98).

The results in table 4.14 shows that a low number of children do have lunch at school with a mean of (M = 2.92) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.01).

The results in table 4.14 shows a high agreement of respondents that poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout in universal secondary schools with a mean of (M = 2.06) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.11).

The results in table 4.14 shows that a moderate opinion of respondents about low economic status contribute to school dropout in USE schools with a mean of (M = 2.48) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.13).

The results in table 4.14 shows that to a greater extent charging fees at school influence school dropout with a mean of (M = 2.05) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.11).

The results in table 4.14 shows that there is a moderate agreement that students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like agricultural activities with a mean of (M = 2.48) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.13).

The results in table 4.14 shows that poor prices for crops to a smaller extent influence school dropout with a mean of (M = 2.58) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.14).

The results in table 4.14 shows that a high agreement of respondents that students drop out of school to involve in child labor with a mean of (M = 2.03) and standard deviation of (SD = 1.11).

**4.3 Socio-cultural factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary Schools in Kyegegwa District**

In this section, the study sought to present and discuss the findings on the socio-cultural factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa District.

**4.3.1 Whether students drop out of school because of early marriages/pregnancies.**

The study sought to find out whether early marriages / pregnancies in the community influences USE students drop outs and the findings are presented in the table 4.15

**Table 4.15 showing whether early marriages / pregnancies has influenced School dropout**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 06 | 30 | 41 | 15 | 92 | 59.4 |
| Agree  | 03 | 19 | 25 | 03 | 50 | 32.3 |
| Disagree  | 00 | 01 | 05 | 01 | 07 | 4.5 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 00 | 03 | 01 | 05 | 3.2 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 01 | 00 | 01 | 0.6 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

Table 4.15 shows that a cumulative majority 91.7% agreed that early marriages / pregnancies causes School dropout, 48.2% disagreed, and 0.6% were not sure, that drop out of school in Kyegegwa District is attributed to early marriages. This is because most schools have no accommodation and students are renting in the nearby trading centers of Wekomiire, Rwera among others. This has increased USE immorality leading to early marriages and pregnancies. This is in line with Kasente (2017) and Kakuru (2008) who explain how a early marriages influence children’s dropping out of school especially as regards the girl child as it is perceived by parents that marrying off the girl child is an escape route of poverty.

This also agrees with UPPAP (2010) put forward that marriage, pregnancy and sickness are the major causes of drop out among girl school children. The issue of early marriages / pregnancies was also emphasized by the head teacher of Wekomiire S.S. Mr Ngobi John, who asserted that in his school many girls are dropping out of USE school because of early pregnant. He said For instance last year 4 girls dropped out of senior two because of early pregnancies, by UCE in October 2018 six students sat for UNEB while pregnant; so he stresses that the rate of early pregnancies is very rampant due to poor accommodation, students are renting in poor houses in Wekomiire trading center with no security”. Drug abuse has led to children dropping out of school.

**4.3.2 showing whether social evils like drug abuse has led to children dropping out of USE schools**

The study sought to find out whether drug abuse has led to children dropping out of USE schools and the findings are presented in table 4.16 below

**Table 4.16 whether social evils like bad behaviors, drug abuse has led to children dropping out of schools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 05 | 19 | 15 | 13 | 52 | 33.5 |
| Agree  | 03 | 25 | 34 | 06 | 68 | 43.9 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 06 | 16 | 01 | 24 | 15.5 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 00 | 08 | 00 | 09 | 5.8 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 02 | 00 | 02 | 1.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

On whether students Drop out of school because of drug abuse, a cumulative 77.4% of respondents agreed that drug abuse influences students drop outs in USE schools, 21.3% disagreed, while only 1.3% were not sure.

This implies that students in USE schools drop out because of drug abuse, which limit their attention span and end up dropping out of school. Interviews provided that the main social behavior causing school dropout was peer pressure with a percentage of 54%, 36% stressed that students drop out of school because of fornication, 6% revealed that students’ attendance of disco dances influenced them to drop out, 4% that it was because of drug abuse and only supported the view that they dropped out because of smoking. This implies that peer pressure was the major bad social behaviors contributing to school dropouts in USE schools in Kyegegwa district.

**4.3.3 Whether dropping out of USE school is due to disco.**

The researcher sought to find out whether School dropout of USE schools because they may involve in disco as presented in table 4.17 below.

**Table 4.17 Showing whether dropping out USE schools is due to attendance to discos.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 06 | 06 | 02 | 15 | 9.7 |
| Agree  | 04 | 13 | 12 | 08 | 37 | 23.9 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 13 | 14 | 06 | 34 | 21.9 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 07 | 24 | 04 | 36 | 23.2 |
| Not sure  | 03 | 11 | 19 | 00 | 33 | 23.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.17 above an average of 45.1% disagreed that students drop out of school because of discos, only 33.6% agreed that students drop out of school because of this discos and 21.3% were not sure whether discos influence students’ drop out of school. This implies disco is not a major cause of school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa District

**4.3.4 Whether low status of girls in society encourage school dropout;**

The study sought to find out whether low status of girls in society encourage school dropout from USE schools in Kyegegwa District as presented in table 4.1.8 below

**Table 4.18 showing whether the low status of girls in society in society encourage drop outs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 07 | 18 | 05 | 31 | 20 |
| Agree  | 04 | 18 | 20 | 10 | 52 | 33.5 |
| Disagree  | 04 | 15 | 17 | 03 | 39 | 25.2 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 10 | 12 | 02 | 24 | 15.5 |
| Not sure  | 01 | 00 | 08 | 00 | 09 | 5.8 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.18 above accumulative 53.5% of respondents agreed that low status of girls in society encourage school dropout, 25.2% disagreed 15.5% strongly disagreed and 5.8% were not sure whether low status of girls in society encourage school dropout. This is in line with UNICEF (2005) which indicates that low social economic status directly correlates with high school dropout. This implies that low status of girls in society children in society influence School dropout in Kyegegwa District

**4.3.5 Whether illiteracy level of parents/in society influence school dropout in the USE schools**

There research sought to find out whether illiteracy level of parents influence School dropout in schools as illustrated in table below.

**Table 4.19 showing weather illiteracy level of parents (in the community) influence school dropout in USE schools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 04 | 09 | 26 | 08 | 47 | 30.3 |
| Agree  | 02 | 25 | 24 | 04 | 55 | 35.5 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 06 | 13 | 04 | 25 | 16.1 |
| Strongly disagree  | 02 | 09 | 09 | 04 | 24 | 15.5 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 01 | 03 | 00 | 04 | 2.6 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table for 4.19 above accumulative majority of 55.8% agreed that illiteracy level of parents in the community influence school dropout in USE schools, 31.6% disagreed, 15.5% strongly disagreed and 2.6% were not sure. the majority 55.8% is an indication that students drop out of school because of illiteracy level of parents; this is an agreement with Holmes (2008) who showed that parents education has an impact on schooling of children; that children of more educated parents are more likely to be enrolled and more likely to progress further through school Holmes (2008) further shows this impact differs by gender, the education of the Father increases the expected level School retention of boys and that of the mother advances attainment of Girls. Many respondents support that if a parent is not educated; their children are more likely to drop out of USE School in Kyegegwa District.

**4.3.6 Orphans are able complete secondary education due to death of parents**

The study sought to find out whether orphans do not complete their secondary school education cycle and the findings are presented in table below;

**Table 4.20 Showing whether orphans do not complete secondary education due to death of their parents.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 03 | 07 | 18 | 06 | 34 | 21.9 |
| Agree  | 04 | 18 | 19 | 08 | 49 | 31.6 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 15 | 12 | 04 | 33 | 21.3 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 00 | 10 | 02 | 13 | 8.4 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 10 | 16 | 00 | 26 | 16.8 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

According to table 4.19 an average respondents of 53.5% agreed that orphans do not complete their secondary school education, 29.3% disagreed, that orphans do not complete School, 8.4% were not sure. This implies that orphans do not complete their Secondary School. The research findings in line with Nakanyike et al 2012 showed that the loss of parents make students to lack school requirements, hence making children drop out of schools.

**4.3.7 Whether corporal punishments have increase students drop outs**

The researcher sought to find out whether corporal punishments influences School dropout in USE schools as Illustrated in the table below

**Table 4.21 Showing corporal punishments have increased student drop out in USE schools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 06 | 30 | 41 | 15 | 92 | 59.4 |
| Agree  | 03 | 19 | 25 | 03 | 50 | 32.3 |
| Disagree  | 00 | 01 | 05 | 01 | 07 | 4.5 |
| Strongly disagree  | 09 | 00 | 03 | 01 | 05 | 3.2 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 01 | 00 | 01 | 0.6 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

Table 2.21 shows that accumulative majority of 91.7% agreed that Corporal punishments contribute a lot to students Drop out, 7.7% disagreed, and only 0.6% of the respondents were not sure. This implies that subjecting students to corporal punishment contribute a lot to their dropping out of school.

**4.3.8 Whether poor parents’ perception/negative attitude towards education lead drop out.**

The research sought to find out whether parents perception to towards education lead to drop out.

**Table 4.22 Showing whether poor parents’ perception/negative attitude towards education leads to drop out.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 07 | 18 | 05 | 31 | 20.0 |
| Agree  | 04 | 18 | 20 | 10 | 52 | 33.5 |
| Disagree  | 04 | 15 | 17 | 03 | 39 | 25.2 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 10 | 12 | 02 | 29 | 15.5 |
| Not sure  | 01 | 00 | 08 | 00 | 09 | 5.8 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.22 on whether parents perception/negative attitude towards education leads to drop out of USE schools; a cumulative percentage of 53.5% showed that poor parents perception towards education lead to school dropout, 40.7% disagreed that poor perception towards lead to drop out in USE schools, 5.8% strongly disagree, and this implies that if parents have poor perception towards education contribute to average School Dropout. This is a line with Holmes 2008 who shows that parents’ perception has a big impact on students’ retention at school.

**4.3.9 Responses from school dropout and their parents**

On socio-cultural factors responsible for school dropout the researcher carried out an interview on school dropout and their parents and the following were the major findings;

**Figure4.7 showing responses from respondents on socio-cultural factors responsible for dropout in USE schools.**

Source: Primary data

According to figure 4.7 above, early marriages contributed to school dropout up to 42%, 35% 0f the respondents revealed that they or their children dropped out because of corporal punishments,9% revealed that it was low status of girls in society, 6% revealed that illiteracy of the parents forced them to drop out, 3% it was because of poor parents’ perception towards education, another 3% revealed that students dropout because of death of parents,01% said that it was due to social evils like misbehavior, and also another 1% of the respondents revealed that it was of low status of girls in society that influenced students’ drop out.

According to Winnie Kobusinge aged 16 years dropped out from S.1 laments that she dropped out of school because of early pregnancy. She was impregnated in S.1 and parents were so much annoyed and they couldn't take her back to school. When Winnie was interviewed on whether she can go back to school, she said that she can if given school fees because now the government under USE cannot pay for her since she has missed two years.

Other school dropout claimed that they dropped out of school because of peer pressure to a tune of 45%. 6% revealed that students attendance of discos and drug abuse influenced them to dropping out of USE schools, 14% that it was because of Corporal punishments, 20% showed that they dropped out because of early marriage / pregnancies, 5% showed that it was because of the status of girls and their mothers in society and 10% said it was because of orphanage this implies that most students drop out of USE schools because of peer influenced pressure.

Interviews with key informants revealed that several social-cultural factors such as Bullying; Early/forced marriage due to illiteracy in the community, Corporal punishment, at school and home, Prostitution, bad social behavior like; Peer pressure, watching films/ video shows, Discos, perceived low value of formal education as well as low, status of girls and their mothers in society were the major social cultural factors responsible for school dropout.

The parents also reviewed that many children drop out of USE schools is because of corporal punishment; teachers would punish their children heavily making them drop out of school. Katusabe Kevin a parent of Bagonza Francis a drop out asserts that the boy left school because of peer pressure. Others claim that their children dropped out of school because of early pregnancies; this is supported by Karungi Rosemary a resident of Wekomiire who claims that her daughter dropped out of school because of early pregnancy.

**4.3.10 Mean and Standard deviation of Socio-cultural factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa district**

The study sought to find out he the mean and standard deviation of respondents views on socio- cultural factors responsible for school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district.

**Table 4.23: showing the Mean and standard deviation of the socio- cultural factors responsible for school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | N | Mean | Standard deviation |
| Early marriages / pregnancies in our community has influenced drop outs | 155 | 1.54 | 0.98 |
| Social evils like drug abuse has led to children dropping out of school | 155 | 2.21 | 1.01 |
| Dropping out of school is due to discos | 155 | 4.29 | 0.98 |
| Whether is low status of girls in society in encourage school dropout | 155 | 2.54 | 1.17 |
| Whether illiteracy level of parents(in the community) influence drop outs | 155 | 2.25 | 0.85 |
| Orphans do not complete secondary education due to death of parent | 155 | 2.67 | 1.01 |
| Corporal punishments have increased USE student drop outs | 155 | 1.54 | 0.91 |
| Poor parents perception/negative attitude towards education leading to drop out | 155 | 2.54 | 0.94 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 155 |  |  |

**Source: primary data**

The results in table 4.23 shows a high number of students drop out of school because of early marriages / pregnancies in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District with a mean of M=1 54 and standard deviation of SD= 0.98.

The results in table 4.23 also shows that students drop out of school because of bad behaviors like drug abuse with a mean of M = 2.21 and standard deviation of SD =1.01.

Also the same table 4.23 shows that average number of respondents agree that students drop out of school because of discos with a mean of M = 4.29 and standard deviation of SD=0.98

Also the same table 4.23 shows that average number of respondents agreed that low status of girls in society encouraged School dropout with the mean of m = 2.54 and standard deviation of SD =1.17.

The results in table 4.23 shows that average illiteracy level of parents influence school dropout with a mean of M = 2.24 and standard deviation of SD=0.85.

The results in the table 4.23 above also shows that average orphans do not complete school because of death of their parents with a mean of m = 2.67 and standard deviation of SD =1.01.

That results in table 4.23 shows that there is a high agreement that students drop out of school because they are subjected to corporal punishments with a mean of m = 1.54 and standard deviation of SD = 0.91.

The results in table 4.23 shows that an average of poor parent perception/negative attitude towards education influence students dropping out of school with the mean of m = 2.54 and standard deviation of SD =0.94.

* 1. **School factors accountable for school dropout in Universal Secondary Schools in Kyegegwa District**

In this section, the researcher sought to present and discuss the findings on school factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa District as explained below;

**4.4.1 Showing whether there was good student-teacher relationship at school**

 The study sought to find out whether there is good student-teacher relationship in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa District. The findings are presented in the table below;

**Table4.24 showing whether student teacher relationship is good in USE Schools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 04 | 09 | 26 | 08 | 47 | 30.3 |
| Agree  | 03 | 20 | 24 | 08 | 55 | 35.5 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 17 | 18 | 02 | 39 | 25.2 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 04 | 05 | 02 | 12 | 7.7 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 02 | 00 | 02 | 1.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.24 above there is accumulative majority of respondents which show that there is teacher-student relationship at school of 55.8%, 29.9% disagree that student-teacher relationship was not good, and 1.3% was not sure. This implies that when student-teacher relationship is good they'll be increased retention of students in Universal Secondary School, when it is poor students will drop out of school.

**4.4.2 Whether noise at school influence drop out in Universal Secondary Schools.**

This is sought to find out if the schools noise at school influence dropouts as illustrated in table 4.25 below;

**Table 4.25 Showing whether students drop out of school because of noise at school**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 03 | 23 | 24 | 10 | 60 | 38.7 |
| Agree  | 01 | 17 | 25 | 06 | 49 | 31.6 |
| Disagree  | 06 | 02 | 11 | 04 | 23 | 14.8 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 07 | 09 | 00 | 16 | 10.3 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 01 | 06 | 00 | 07 | 4.5 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

Table 4.25 above shows that on average accumulative percentage of 70.3% agreed that students do not experience noise at school while 25.3% disagreed with the view that there is no noise at school and 4.5% of the respondents were not sure; this implies that most Universal Secondary School students on average are affected by noise at school which may make them even drop out of school.

**4.4.3 Whether USE schools have good conducive study environment in relation to school dropout:**

The researcher sought to find out whether there is a good conducive study environment in USE schools; as illustrated in table 4.26 below.

**Table 4.26 Showing whether USE schools have good conducive study environment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 02 | 01 | 10 | 02 | 15 | 9.7 |
| Agree  | 01 | 16 | 15 | 03 | 35 | 22.6 |
| Disagree  | 04 | 17 | 20 | 10 | 51 | 32.9 |
| Strongly disagree  | 03 | 16 | 30 | 05 | 54 | 34.8 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.26 above shows that only 32.3 % of respondents, agreed that that schools have good conducive study environment, accumulative majority of 67.7% disagreed with the view that schools have a good study environment; this implies that most USE schools in Kyegegwa District have poor school environment which affects learning process and students retention at school influencing School dropout.

**4.4.4 Whether class congestion affects learners’ completion of school**

The researcher sought to find out whether class congestion affects learners’ completion of school and hence drop out as illustrated in table 2.27 below:

**Table 2.27 Showing whether class congestion affects learners’ completion of secondary school;**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 07 | 16 | 24 | 15 | 62 | 40 |
| Agree  | 02 | 15 | 28 | 03 | 48 | 31 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 09 | 10 | 01 | 21 | 13.5 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 10 | 06 | 01 | 17 | 11 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 07 | 00 | 07 | 4.5 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According table 4.27 accumulative majorities of 71% of the respondents agreed that class congestion affects learners’ completion of school while 24.5% of the respondents disagreed and 11% strongly disagreed and 4.5% were not sure; this implies that class congestion affects learners’ completion of school and may lead to drop out.

**4.4.5 Whether USE schools have enough instructional materials like text books and science apparatus in relation to drop outs**

In this section, the researcher sought to establish whether schools have enough textbooks for the smooth learning by students and whether lack of enough instructional materials like textbooks and science apparatus affect students’ dropping out of school; as Illustrated in the table 4.28 below.

**Table 4.28 Showing whether USE schools have enough text books, apparatus for science subjects:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 01 | 01 | 05 | 02 | 09 | 5.8 |
| Agree  | 01 | 09 | 04 | 01 | 15 | 9.7 |
| Disagree  | 04 | 19 | 29 | 09 | 61 | 39.4 |
| Strongly disagree  | 04 | 21 | 37 | 08 | 70 | 45.1 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.28 above accumulative majority of 84.5% disagreed, it showed that USE schools do not have enough textbooks, only 9.7% agreed that schools have textbooks, 5.8% strongly agree with the view that schools have enough textbooks this implies that many USE schools lack enough textbooks / reference books so as to enable learners learn smoothly. This in turn encourages students to drop out of USE schools.

**4.5.6 Whether Inappropriate Curriculum influence school dropout.**

This study sought to establish whether inappropriate curriculum influence school dropout as Illustrated in table 4.29 below:

**Table 4.29; showing whether inappropriate curriculum influence school dropout.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 06 | 11 | 32 | 10 | 59 | 38.1 |
| Agree  | 02 | 31 | 30 | 07 | 70 | 45.2 |
| Disagree  | 01 | 05 | 11 | 02 | 19 | 12.3 |
| Strongly disagree  | 01 | 01 | 02 | 00 | 04 | 2.6 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 00 | 01 | 03 | 1.9 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

Table 4.29 above indicates that accumulative majority of 83.3% of the respondents agreed that inappropriate curriculum influence school dropout, 14.9% disagree and 1.9% of the respondents were not sure. The majority 83.3% implies that the government through the National Curriculum Development Centre should design a curriculum which is suitable for learners catering for the three domains i.e. cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains, so as to reduce on the rate of school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district.

**4.4.7 Whether USE schools have enough facilities like furniture and classrooms and other infrastructure.**

This study sought to find out whether USE schools have enough facilities like furniture and classrooms for students to study from, in relation to students dropping out of school; as Illustrated in the table 4.30 below;

**Table 4.30 showing whether USE schools have enough furniture, classrooms and other infrastructure.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 02 | 03 | 13 | 02 | 20 | 12.9 |
| Agree  | 02 | 16 | 12 | 01 | 31 | 20 |
| Disagree  | 04 | 20 | 47 | 08 | 79 | 51 |
| Strongly disagree  | 02 | 09 | 03 | 09 | 23 | 14.8 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 00 | 00 | 02 | 1.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to table 4.30 above accumulative majority of 65.8% disagreed with the view that USE schools have enough facilities, 32.9% agreed that USE schools have enough furniture and classrooms, that USE schools have enough facilities, 1.3% of the respondents were not sure. This implies that most USE schools do not have enough facilities, this affects the learning activities hence influencing in school dropout.

**4.4.8 Whether students walk long distances to school**

The study sought to find out whether students walk long distance to Universal Secondary Schools in relation to school dropout.

**Table 31: showing whether students walk long distances to USE schools.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONSES** | **FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS** | **Total****Fr**e**quency** | **Percentage** |
|  | HTRS & Deputies | Teachers  | Students  | B.O.G |
| Strongly agree  | 05 | 22 | 35 | 10 | 72 | 46.7 |
| Agree  | 03 | 20 | 29 | 05 | 57 | 26.8 |
| Disagree  | 02 | 04 | 05 | 03 | 14 | 9.0 |
| Strongly disagree  | 00 | 02 | 06 | 02 | 10 | 6.5 |
| Not sure  | 00 | 02 | 00 | 00 | 02 | 1.3 |
| **Total**  |  | **155** | **100** |

Source: Primary data

According to the table 4.30 above shows that 73.3% of the respondents shows that most students walk long distances to school, 15.5% disagree and 1.3% strongly agree that students walk long distances to school. This means that students walk long distances to school in hence affecting their retention leading to dropping out.

**4.4.9 Responses from school dropout and their parents**

The researcher sought to investigate the various school factors that pushed these dropouts out of school as illustrated below:

**Figure 4.8 Showing the responses from school dropout and their parents on school factors accountable for school dropout:**

Source: Primary data

According to Figure 4.8 above, majority of the respondents claimed that that they dropped out of school because of lack of facilities like class rooms and toilets, 20% said it was because of walking long distances, 15% percent of the respondents revealed that it was due to lack of a conducive study environment for teaching and 10% revealed that it was due to poor teacher-student relationship, 8% said that it was due to lack of enough instructional materials like text books and apparatus for practical in science subject, 5% said it was because of class congestion, 4% was due to inappropriate curriculum, 2% was because of Noise at school.

Interviews with school administrators also agreed with the school dropout and their parents views by sighting that Inadequate school infrastructure, lack of scholastic materials, Inappropriate curriculum, unskilled teachers, lack of enough classroom, Teachers Absenteeism, Irregular meetings with teachers/parents as well as long distances such as walking about 6km to and fro school influenced high level of school dropout in Kyegegwa town council secondary schools.

* + 1. **School factors responsible for school dropout in universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District.**

The study sought to present and discuss the findings on the mean and standard deviation of the School factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa District.

**Table 4.32: Showing the mean and standard deviation of the School factors responsible for school dropout in Universal Secondary School in Kyegegwa District.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES  | N  | MEAN  | STANDARD DEVIATION  |
| Student teacher relationship is good at in USE schools  | 155 | 2.14 | 0.78 |
| Noise at school influence school dropouts  | 155 | 2,58 | 0.92 |
| The school provide a conducive study environment  | 155 | 2.93  | 1.29 |
| Class congestion affects learners completion of studies  | 155  | 2.09 | 1.14 |
| The schools has enough text books, science apparatus for  | 155  | 3.24  | 1.12 |
| Inappropriate curriculum influence school dropouts | 155  | 2,92 | 1.35 |
| The school has enough furniture and classrooms  | 155 | 2.72 | 0.78 |
| Students walk long distance to school  | 155 | 1,79 | 0.81 |
| Valid N (List wise)  | 155  |  |  |

*Source: Primary data*.

On the school factors accountable for school dropout in universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District.

The results in table 4.32 shows an average agreement of respondents on whether there is good student teacher relationship with a mean of (M=2.14) and standard deviation of (SD=0.78)

In the same table 4.32 above shows that on average students in USE schools are affected by noise with a mean of (M=2.58) and standard deviation (SD=0.92).

Table 4.32 above also shows that most USE schools have conducive study environment to enable the smooth teaching and learning process with a mean of (M=2.93) and standard deviation of (SD=1.29)

Table 4.32 also shows that class congestion affects greatly school dropout because many respondents agreed that class congestion affected many learners to drop out of school with a mean of (M=2.09) and standard deviation of (SD=1.14)

Table 4.32 also indicates that most USE schools do not have enough facilities like text books and science apparatus to enable learners be motivated to remain in school; hence leading to drop out with a mean of (M=3.24) and standard deviation of (SD =1.12)

In reference to table 4.32 above inappropriate curriculum influence learners to drop out of school with a mean of (M=2.92) and standard deviation of (SD =1.35).

Results in table 4.32 above indicate that school to a high extent do not have enough furniture and classrooms with a mean of (M=2.72) and standard Deviation of (SD =0.78).

Table 4.32 shows that many students walk long distances to school which influence them to drop out of school with a mean of (M=1.79) and standard deviation of (SD =0.81)

* 1. **WAYS HOW SCHOOL DROPOUT CAN BE REDUCED IN USE SCHOOLS IN KYEGEGWA DISTRICT.**

The researcher sought to find out the ways / solutions on how drop outs can be reduced in USE schools in Kyegegwa District. The following views were got from 155 respondents and are presented in the figure below:

**Figure 4.9 showing the responses from respondents on way USE schools in Kyegegwa district.**

**Source: Primary data**

According to the figure 4.9 above the mostly raised views of reducing dropouts were; Parents and teachers should reduce on corporal punishments with 25%, parents should provide scholastic materials to their children with 22%, Girls should be provided with sanitary materials so as to enable them stay in school with 16% and other ways included: conducive study environment 7%, Government should introduce strict laws 6%, parents should pay fees on time with 5%, good teacher-student relationship also 5%, providing guidance and counseling 4%.

* + 1. **More responses from teachers, head teachers and Board of governors.**

The teachers, head teachers with their deputies further gave the following views;

Government of Uganda should provide enough capitation grant to USE schools; enough text books, construct classes, laboratories and libraries, pay teachers prompt and make lunch compulsory in schools. .

The government should invest highly in agriculture to enable the peasantry community boost their socio economic status so that they can support their children’s education.

Local governments should identify the needy and disadvantaged students and provide them with scholastic materials, guidance and counseling to reduce the rate of school dropout.

There should be government intervention on students who drop out of Use schools. The government should make a serious follow up on those involved in child labor and be reprimanded punished.

The government should put measures to combat problems of drug abuse and provide services to school; like libraries and laboratories and put policies in place which can reduce on drop outs.

The school administrators should not charge too much additional fees to students; schools should also provide enough text books and other scholastic material to learners;

Corporal punishments should be avoided by both parents at home and teachers at school; this will help to curb on students dropping out of school.

* + 1. **Other responses from students.**

The following views were also got from students on other ways of curbing drop out in Kyegegwa district:

The government should make universal secondary education totally free and provide all the necessary requirements like lunch, books, pens, pencils, buildings and pay all the teachers attractive salaries. The government should further give financial aid to orphans to enable them complete school because when such children are given special consideration it will help to keep them in school.

Teachers should stop punishing students by giving them corporal punishments as corporal punishments deter students from attending school.

Parents and teachers should provide guidance and counseling to students, by showing them the dangers of early pregnancies and early marriages, attending discos, drug abuse among others. The senior women and men teachers should also always guide and counsel students, on good behaviors and conduct at school and at home; so as to avoid early pregnancies and early marriages.

There should also be co-operation between teachers and students i.e. teachers should ensure good relationship to enable learners stay in schools the issue of academic parents should be introduced in schools

School heads should try to improve on school environment, improve the nature of classes.

Parents should be sensitized on the importance of educating their children and providing them with necessities like books, uniforms, so as to keep them at school. They should be encouraged to provide enough scholastic materials to their children especially the girl child; and provide lunch to their children

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**5.0 Introduction**

This chapter presents discussion of findings, a summary of the major findings, conclusions, there after recommendation of the study and areas of further studies as well as answering the objectives of the study. The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district. Discussion and conclusions on the other hand involve issues found out in the study.

 **5.1 Discussion of the Major Findings**

The study examined the factors influencing in school dropout in USE schools in Kyegegwa district. A total of 215 respondents in the sample size population were involved giving a response rate of 100%. They were 20 board members, 10 head teachers and their deputies, 50 teachers, 75 students, 30 parents of school dropout and 30 school dropouts, participated in the study. With varying education levels the majority of respondents had been working or parents/school dropout with experience about reasons (factors) why students drop out of school. This implies that these respondents had salient views about factors influencing school dropout in USE schools. Consequently some of the study findings agree with the conceptual frame work that was developed to guide the study while others do not. However, all in all, the study found out that the economic, socio- cultural and school factors influencing school dropout were still a major challenge affecting learners’ retention in USE schools.

The summary and conclusions of the study are presented in line with the specific of the study, that is;

1. To establish the economic factors responsible for school dropout USE schools in Kyegegwa district.
2. To investigate the socio-cultural factors responsible for USE schools drop outs in Kyegegwa district.
3. To identify the school factors accountable for USE school dropout in Kyegegwa district.

**5.1.1 The economic factors influencing school dropouts in Kyegegwa district.**

Research findings revealed that the majority 62.6% agreed that parents do provide their children with enough scholastic materials. In the same study 65.2% of the respondents disagreed with the view that parents do provide their children with lunch at school. Furthermore the majority of 68.9% of the respondents in table 4.8 agreed that poverty is the most contributing factor to school dropout; where as 61.9% supported that low economic status contribute to school dropout in USE schools. The indicators/ characteristics of poverty level were measured from lack of sufficient income among parents which caused difficulties in paying for building fee, buying school uniforms as well as exercise and textbooks for their children.

The research study also found out that, high costs being met by parents as the government does not provide all necessary school requirements such as: school uniforms, scholastic materials, lunch at school, top-up of teacher’s salaries that are not on pay roll, building funds and others, instigated drop out. Further still the highest number of day students studied on empty stomach from morning to evening due to high poverty, (tables 4.6 - table 4.14). The above findings is similar to Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2014) report which indicated that enrolment declined as the number of students who enrolled in Senior one had declined by 45% compared to those who completed Senior four in 2018. And on the other hand senior five entrants declined by 32% in comparison to those who sat advanced level UNEB examinations in 2018. The findings further are synonymous to Uganda Poverty Status Report (UPSR 2015), which stipulated that half of the households with children who have dropped out of school cite lack of money as the main problem. The report further indicated that the condition worsened when schools demanded pupils pay for lunch and building funds.

Similarly, Cardoso and Dort (2012), stated that high drop out from USE schools continues to pose a challenge to successful implementation of the policy as evidenced in the UNHS report of 2015-2016 which found that many children do not complete secondary despite the existence of USE. However some few students from better off households are more likely to remain in school, while those who are poorer are more likely never to have attended, or to drop out once they have enrolled.

The finding is further supported by Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS, 2014), which showed that 24.5% of Ugandans, most of whom children, are living below the poverty line and drop out of school before completion of secondary level due to a lack of school fees. Another majority of 76.1% agreed that charging additional fees in USE schools contribute to school dropouts. Therefore, poor parents who no longer pay fees claimed that books and uniform cost more than fees and end up allowing implementation their children to drop out of school. This is most likely to cause a long term effect on the students life time as they are more likely to be unemployed and impoverished, compared to their colleagues who continued schooling. Therefore, it is imperative for the Government of Uganda to re-consider implementation of the Millennium Development Goals such as Poverty Eradication Schemes among in order to build the education system and enhance effective of USE.

In the research study an average majority of respondents i.e. 62% supported the view that drop out of USE school to involve in other Economic activities; another majority of 77.4% of respondents agreed that students drop out of USE because of child labor. This research study is in line with the 2014 household survey by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) estimated that 2.75 million children in Uganda are engaged in child labor, 51% indicate that l.4million children are involved in hazardous work to buy uniforms, textbooks and associated with school fees. This is in line with MOES Report (2012), which stated that 22% of students drop out of school because of lack of scholastic materials, 14% leave USE to search for full sponsorship, 25% dropout to involve in business activities.

 **5.1.2 The Socio-Cultural Factors Responsible for School dropout**

Chapter four results in Table 4.15 to table 4.22 indicated that several Socio-Cultural Factors Responsible for School dropout. These included;

Early marriage influenced drop out by 59.4% (Table 4.15). In Kyegegwa district, the opportunity cost of sending females to school in rural areas, where girls are married quite early, is high because benefits of their schooling will not accrue to their parental household. The finding is in agreement with Kakuru, (2013), who earlier found out that early marriages influence children’s dropping out of school especially as regards the girl child as it is perceived by parents that marrying off the girl child is an escape route from poverty. The research findings are also in line with the Ministry of Education and Sports report (2012), revealed that the percentage of schools by reasons of drop out; i.e. 10% died, 10% was due to influence by other students, 10% was due to group influence, 25%students get married, 29% was due to parents lack of interest in education, and the majority 59% was due to early pregnancies.

Similarly, Nyanzi (2010) put forward that marriage, pregnancy causes of drop out among girl children. Synonymously, Odaga and Heneveld (2015), observed that parents worry about wasting money on the education of girls because there are most likely to get pregnant or married before completing their schooling and that once married, girls become part of another family and the parental investment in them is lost this therefore perpetuates parents discouraging the girl child from continuing with school. Lack of interest, pregnancy, early marriages, hidden costs at school and family responsibilities have driven thousands out of school.

The World Bank report (2016) on the quality of education depicted poor scores in school exams of which leads to many students being discouraged and end up dropping out USE school (Murphy 2013), In other cases parents encourage girls to drop out or fail to pay their educational costs and arrange marriages for them or encourage them to get married. Most societies define femininity in relation to marriage and girls have been socialized to accept that perspective. This social construction that relates femininity closely with marriage also lower girls’ aspiration for secondary and higher education as most of them do not see the need to excel in education as a value related with marriage ability.

Table 4.19 indicated that over 53.5% of the orphans were not able to complete secondary education. Orphanage, Loss of parent’s makes students to lack of school requirement; loss of parents and parent’s inability to pay, all of which have social and economic dimension. Early pregnancy, chronic illness, poor performance in class, caring for sick relatives, long distance is the main causes of school dropout, (Nakanyike, 2012). The result is supplemented by MFPED, (2012); which stipulated that HIV/AIDS and distance to school appear to be the most common elements that lead to primary school dropout in all studies.

Table 4.20 indicate that a majority of 59.4% of the respondents agreed that corporal punishments influence school dropout, this shows that subjecting students to heavy punishments like caning, and hard labor influence them to drop out of school.

Results in table 4.21 indicated that 69% of the parents experienced a negative attitude towards education. This negative parental attitude towards USE program is assumed to be for the poor and of poor quality. Looking at this situation critically, one can say that these are some of the gaps in USE policy that push disadvantaged children out of school as they are unable to meet all the costs associated with USE and yet the output gained is of poor quality.

The research findings are in line with Ministry of Education and Sports study on Dropout study in Universal Secondary Education prepared by Education Planning and Policy Analysis Department (Statistical section) May 2012, whose findings revealed that, the biggest reason why students leave the USE program is due to early pregnancies (59% of the schools), 31% of the schools revealed that it was due to transfer of parents to other areas, only 10% of the schools reported death, influence of other students and sickness as the causes for students dropping out of USE schools, t in education by influence with 12%, 25% of the students get married, 29% was due to lack of interest by parents.

Parents who place a low value on a high school education transfer this low value to their children, thereby increasing their chances of dropping out of high school. Failure of the USE policy; poor school quality and lack of free secondary education can be directly attributed to failure of USE policy to address these issues at hand and poor planning of USE; while monetary cost, need for children to work in support of their household could have been indirectly addressed if USE took into account the need to meet the costs of USE for children from poor socio-cultural backgrounds, (Colclough et al., 2010).

Interviews with key also informants revealed that several social-cultural factors such as Bullying forced marriage due to illiteracy in the community, Corporal punishment, Children to engage in income earning activities/ child labor, Gambling/Idleness, Prostitution, Peer pressure, watching films/ video shows, Discos, perceived low value of formal education as well as low status of girls in society and their mothers in society.

**5.1.3 The school factors accountable for secondary school dropout;**

Results in tables 4.23 to 4.30 provided several school factors that accounted for Secondary School dropout as;

The study revealed that Poor government funding was one of the main environmental factors influencing school dropout in that school in Kyegegwa lacked sufficient facilities ranging from infrastructures, library, laboratories equipment, and teaching-learning aids. Therefore lack of instruction materials discourages teachers from attending to learners and as well discouraged learners participation in USE, thereby inculcating high level of drop out. The above finding is complementary to Holsinger, Jacob and Migimu (2012); earlier findings in which Ugandan secondary schools mostly boarding schools were found with no running water. Most of the schools depend on rain water trapped into water reservoirs such as plastic tanks. That students rarely attended school which affected their performance level and hence drop out.

 Results in table 4.26 indicated that USE classes were over crowded due to lack of enough learning space or classroom which affected the teaching-learning process hence attributing to high drop out. Fewer classrooms were attributed by poor funding government policy and USE poor planning policies. Poor quality of education, inadequate facilities, overcrowded classrooms accompanied with insufficient learning- teaching materials and resources; Schools, and their teaching materials and resources. Inappropriate languages of instruction, teacher absenteeism and, in the case of girls’ school safety, are common causes for school dropout as it is supplemented by Colclough, et al. (2010). These are seen as supply side causes of drop out, mainly driven at the school level. 30 percent do not continue in school post Grade 4 in primary school (UNESCO, 2010).

The study results further indicated that frequent needs of the schools required students to be sent home regularly to collect funds for projects (building fee). Most often 63.8% students who were frequently sent home to collect scholastic materials dropped out because parents were poor to afford them. This result agrees with Samarrail, (2007); who observed that poor parents preferred to keep children sent away from school in agricultural work. This seasonal work clashed with schooling timetables, leading to seasonal withdrawals from school. While still in school, children who are falling behind due to regular absences, temporary withdrawals and heavy out of school workloads, could be members of the silently excluded; those who attend, but fail to engage adequately in teaching and learning processes.

Interviews with key informants also agreed with the students views by sighting that inadequate school infrastructure, lack of scholastic materials, inappropriate curriculum, unskilled teachers, lack of enough classrooms, Teachers Absenteeism, Irregular meetings with teachers/parents as well as long distances such as walking about 6km to and fro school influenced high level of school dropout in Kyegegwa town council secondary schools.

The failure of students to find positive social relationships in schools and the lack of a climate of caring and support also appear to be related to increased rates of dropping out. Positive relationships between teachers and students and among students and a climate of shared purpose and concern have been cited as key elements in schools that hold students until graduation. This is in agreement with earlier findings presented in chapter two such as, (Scharff and Brady, 2013).

The main focus is on the USE policy gaps that contribute to school dropouts. For example, according to (Nakanyike et al, 2012), drop out in USE school is to a certain extend attributed to the parents, and schools which focus more on increasing the enrolment in schools while neglecting the efforts to retain the therein. This makes it to seem as though the aim of USE in Uganda is to have big numbers enrolled in schools without minding on their completion. It is this community concern that captured the researcher’s interest in the area of USE policy gaps and their contribution to school dropout since the reality on ground shows low completion rate which contradicts what the main goals USE program, (Ananga E., 2010).

Interviews with key informants also agreed with the students views by sighting that Inadequate school infrastructure, lack of scholastic materials, Inappropriate curriculum, unskilled teachers, lack of enough classroom, Teachers Absenteeism, Irregular meetings with teachers/parents as well as long distances such as walking about 6km to and fro school influenced high level of school dropouts in Kyegegwa town council secondary schools. This research study is also supported by MOES (20120 on school dropout which revealed that 20% of schools explained that students dropped out of USE schools because of long distance covered from home to school, 22% said students dropped out because of lack of scholastic materials among others.

More so, interviews with key informants revealed that schools had the following strategies to curb drop out; Motivation of teachers, allowing students study without uniform and sensitization parents. Alongside school factors government’s efforts to reduce drop out encompassed; Increase School funding for infrastructural development, Recruitment of more teachers but not meeting all children educational requirements. Therefore further provided the key strategies that should be undertaken to reduce drop out as; eradication of poverty among parents, improving teacher performance, needs continual focus on content and delivery of skills during pre-service and in-service training programs to reduce drop out, Parents/guardians should be mobilized and sensitized about the dangers school dropout and promotion of girl child education.

**5.2 Summary of the major findings**

Basing the discussion of findings, school dropout was characterized by several factors that included; institutional, cultural, socio-economic, poverty as well as political factors. All of which require different interventions for a long lasting quality education.

In the research study, lack of interest ranked the highest cause of drop out. Children to engage in income earning activities, illiteracy in the community, resulting from the perceived low value of formal education, the low status of girls in society and their mothers in society, school factors (peer pressure, video shows and discos) and the nomadic lifestyle of some groups, resulting in inability of children to stay at school.

Among the school factors are inadequate school infrastructure and scholastic materials, bullying by the older children, poor motivation of teachers, corporal punishment and ‘inappropriate’ curriculum. The effects identiﬁed by the participants included crime in general, idleness, prostitution, involvement in petty trade, and undermining formal education and the girl child status.55.4% cases of drop out for secondary school children, was because of monetary costs associated with schooling.

Early marriage, especially in the case of girls is a common strategy used by poor families to raise income for the rest of household members, more practiced in rural than urban areas. Many girls perceive marriage as an escape route from family poverty while the common cultural practice of charging bride wealth brings quick and substantial income to her family. Girls sometimes withdraw themselves from school, especially if their needs for supplies like shoes and dresses are not met by their parents/ guardians. In other cases parents encourage girls to drop out or fail to pay their educational costs and arrange marriages for them or encourage them to get married.

The failure of students to find positive social relationships in schools and the lack of a climate of caring and support also appear to be related to increased rates of dropping out. Positive relationships between teachers and students and among students and a climate of shared purpose and concern have been cited as key elements in schools that hold students until graduation

The study provided that prevention efforts to the above factors fall under three major categories: school-based approaches, environmental approaches, and system-building approaches. School- based approaches have included both programs and practices designed to enhance the prospects for student academic success and those designed to strengthen the positive social relationships and climate of support and concern of students found in school. Environmental approaches have included strategies to address unsupportive outside conditions by developing new relationships between families and schools and the integration of educational and human services to address the social and economic problems that impede progress through school. System-building approaches include all those activities entailed in continuing to expand secondary education in those societies in which secondary schooling is not widely available.

**5.3 Conclussion**

The study determined that the major economic factors why students dropped out of USE in Kyegegwa District was that Parents could not pay for development fees which is even higher than school fees in most USE secondary schools. The study established that a lot of pressure is exerted on the children to take on income generating activities in order to contribute to 32.7% their family’s economic needs, lack of school requirements contributed by loss of parents (18.4%) and parents’ inability to provide children with school requirements (14.3%) with the remaining 34.6% of other economic factors.

The study also determined the socio-cultural factors that included early pregnancies, peer influence, lack of interest in education of their children, death of the parents which limit the students’ participation, enrolment and performance in USE secondary schools

 The school factors found out in the research study included poor conducive study environment, lack of instructional materials, class congestion and long distance from home to school, were the major school factors influencing school dropouts. According to the research study findings there is need to sensitize parents about the importance of educating their children so as to retain them in USE schools.

**5.4 Recommendations**

Government’s plan should focus more resources at secondary school level to cater for scholastic materials, provide school infrastructural development to enhance the learning environment. Government policy on school funding should be reviewed to reconcile the current ban on PTA funds with school and teachers’ requirements.

The government needs to design micro level programs to assist the most vulnerable sections of the population, whose vulnerability has increased with implementation of the structural adjustment programs. The government must make a realistic policy to readjust the wages of all working people and promote rural economic investment to alleviate rural unemployment. The Ministry of Education and sports together should consider scrapping off cost sharing in secondary schools and at the same time urge government to provide eradication interventions in communities in support of education Development.

Directorate of Education Standards and National Curriculum Development Centre and Teacher Training Institutions, should design appropriate mechanisms of enhancing favorable school environment that could motivate the teaching-learning process and curb drop outs. Institutions/colleges, primary and secondary schools should recruit well-qualified Personnel into teaching, providing them with relevant training, and providing incentives for effective service delivery.

Academic attainment of parents is a key factor that influences the chances of a child dropping out of school in both rural and urban areas, and across all age cohorts. I therefore recommend the policy and programs of adult education by government to be rolled out in all parts of the country. The importance of adult education is envisaged to aide in enhancing attitudinal change among illiterate and ignorant parents in favor of child education. Parents should be sensitized about the importance of education.

Parents Teachers Associations and other school related bodies should be strengthened so that they could contribute to the provision of physical facilities of the secondary schools. The provision of more physical facilities especially boarding facilities may improve the performance of students in boarding schools.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) should conduct community mobilization to curb early marriages, pregnancies and sexual transmitted diseases (STDs) among students.

**5.5 Areas of Further Research**

Consequently having carried out the research on the factor in influencing school dropouts in USE schools, other studies in this area may be necessary. Further research should be conducted:

1. To assess the factors affecting learning process, satisfaction and achievement of good grades to motivate students stay in schools.
2. To investigate the causes of low attitudes towards education among learners in secondary schools in Uganda.
3. Further research should be conducted to establish the causes for low levels of school attendance; and gender disparities in school attendance throughout Uganda.
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**APPENDIX A**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS SCHOOL ADMNISTRATORS AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Dear respondent,

I am Kemigisa Rosemary, a student of Nkumba University, pursuing a Masters degree in Educational management and planning. I am conducting a study on “**The factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District – Uganda”.**

The study will be entirely academic, thus any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Instruction: please tick or circle where appropriate the letter corresponding to the best alternative.

**BIO DATA**

1. Gender

 a) Female b) Male

1. Age
2. Below 20 years
3. 25 – 30 years
4. 30 – 35 years
5. 36 – 40 years
6. 41 – 45 years
7. 46 – 50 years
8. Above 50 years
9. Level of education

 a) Masters Degree c) Diploma

 b) Bachelors Degree d) Certificate

1. Length of service

 a) 1 year c) 4- 6 years

 b) 2 – 3 years d) above 6 years

1. Type of employment

 a) Permanent c) Temporary

 b) Contract

SECTION B: ECONOMIC FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SCHOOLDROP OUT

Please tick the best alternative that explains the economic factors contributing to school dropout in your school.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Economic factors contributing to school dropout | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Parents do provide enough scholastic materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| Most students do not have lunch at school : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty is the mostly contributing factor to school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low economic status has contributed to school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charging additional fees at school influence school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like agricultural activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor prices for crops influence drop outs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students drop out of school because of child labor |  |  |  |  |  |

SECTION C: SOCIO- CULTURAL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUT:

Please tick the best alternative that explains the socio- cultural factors responsible for school dropout in your school?

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio- cultural factors contributing to school dropout** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Early marriage/ pregnancies in our community has influenced drop out |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social evils like drug abuse has led to children dropping out of school |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drop outs are due to discos |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low status of girls in society encourage school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illiteracy level of parents/in society leads to drop outs  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orphans do not complete secondary education  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corporal punishments have increased students drop outs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor parents’ perception/ negative attitude towards education lead to drop outs |  |  |  |  |  |

SECTION D: SCHOOL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUT

Please tick the best alternative that explains school factors responsible for school dropout in your school.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School factors contributing to school dropout** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Student teacher relationship is good at our school  |  |  |  |  |  |
| There noise at school influence school dropouts |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has conducive study environment  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class congestion affects learners completion of studies  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has enough textbooks and science apparatus influence school dropouts.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inappropriate curriculum influence school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has enough furniture and classrooms  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students walk long distance to school |  |  |  |  |  |

What recommendations would you give to reduce on the level of students dropping out of school?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*“Thank you for your participation*

**APPENDIX B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDENTS**

Dear respondent,

I am Kemigisa Rosemary, a student of Nkumba University pursuing a Master’s degree in Educational management and planning. I am conducting a study on “*The factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District – Uganda”*.

The study will be entirely academic, thus any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Instruction: Please tick where appropriate in the boxes provided.

1. Gender

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Male | Female |

1. Age

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Below 15 | 16-18 | 21-23 | Above 23 |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Period in school

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1year or less | 2-3 years | 4-6 years | Above 6 years |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Orphanage status

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 parent dead | 2 parents dead | None |

1. Parent or guardian occupation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Peasant | Self employed | Government employee | Privately Employed |
|  |  |  |  |

SECTION B: ECONOMIC FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SCHOOL DROPOUT

Please tick your best alternative that explains the economic factors contributing to school dropout in your school.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Economic factors contributing to school dropout | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Parents do provide enough scholastic materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| Most students do not have lunch at school : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty is the mostly contributing factor to school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low economic status has contributed to school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charging fees at school influence school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students drop out of school to involve in other economic activities like agricultural activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor prices for crops influence drop outs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students drop out of school because of child labour |  |  |  |  |  |

SECTION C: SOCIO- CULTURAL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUT

Please tick the best alternative that explains the socio- cultural factors responsible for school dropout in your school?

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio- cultural factors contributing to school dropout** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Early marriage/ pregnancies in our community has influenced drop out |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social evils like drug abuse has led to children dropping out of school |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drop outs are due to discos |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low status of girls in society encourage school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illiteracy level of parents/in society leads to drop outs  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orphans do not complete secondary education  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corporal punishments have increased students drop outs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents’ perception/negative attitude towards education lead to drop out |  |  |  |  |  |

SECTION D: SCHOOL FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUT

Please tick the best alternative that explains school factors responsible for school dropout in your school.

 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree 5. Not sure

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School factors contributing to school dropout | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student teacher relationship is good at our school  |  |  |  |  |  |
| There noise at school influence school dropout |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has conducive study environment  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class congestion affects learners completion of studies  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has enough like instructional materials textbooks and science apparatus |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inappropriate curriculum influence school dropouts |  |  |  |  |  |
| The school has enough facilities furniture and classrooms  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students walk long distance to school |  |  |  |  |  |

What recommendations would you give to reduce on the level of students dropping out school?

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*“Thank you for your participation*

 **APPENDIX C**

 **INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS**

Dear respondent,

I am Kemigisa Rosemary, a student of Nkumba University pursuing a Masters degree in Educational management and planning. I am conducting a study on “*The factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District – Uganda*”.

The study will be entirely academic, thus any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality. For the great success of the interview the researcher will be guided by the following questions.

1. Do students come to school by 8:00am?
2. What is the longest distance a student walks to come to school?
3. Is drop out a challenge in your school?
4. If yes, what are the possible causes?
5. What are the possible solutions to curb school dropout in your school?

*“Thank you for the participation”*

 **APPENDIX D**

 **INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SCHOOL DROPOUTS**

Dear respondent,

I am Kemigisa Rosemary, a student of Nkumba University pursuing a Masters degree in Educational management and planning. I am conducting a study on **“The factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District – Uganda”.**

The study will be entirely academic, thus any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality. For the great success of the interview the researcher will be guided by the following questions.

* 1. In which class did you dropout from?
	2. What might have caused you to drop out of school?
	3. If given opportunity, can you go back to school?

*Thank you for your participation.*

 **APPENDIX E**

 **INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS**

Dear respondent,

I am Kemigisa Rosemary, a student of Nkumba University pursuing a Masters degree in Educational management and planning. I am conducting a study on **“The factors influencing school dropout in Universal secondary schools in Kyegegwa District – Uganda”.** The study will be entirely academic, thus any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

For the great success of the interview the researcher will be guided by the following questions.

1. Is school dropout a challenge in your area?
2. What could be the possible causes?
3. What should be done to reduce on school dropouts?

***“Thank you for your time and participation”.***

**APPENDIX F: OBSERVATION CHECK LIST**

The research will also be guided by the following observation checklist.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OBSERVATION**  | **YES** | **NO** |
| School environment is good |  |  |
| Students take lunch at school |  |  |
| The school has good structures i.e. classrooms, latrines, laboratories. |  |  |
| Students attend school regularly |  |  |
| Students report at school by 8:00 am |  |  |
| Classes are too congested |  |  |
| Student teacher relationship is good |  |  |
| The school has enough text books and science apparatus |  |  |

**APPENDIX G: WORK PLAN**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **PERSON RESPONSIBLE** | **DEADLINE/SUBMISSION DATE** |
| Research Proposal | Researcher | January-February 2019 |
| Supervisory correction | Supervisor | February-March2019 |
| Research Proposal final | Researcher | April, 2019 |
| Data Collection | Researcher | May-June, 2019 |
| Data Analysis | Researcher | June, 2019 |
| Final Dissertation Report | Researcher | July, 2019 |
| Supervisor’s Correction | Supervisor | July-August 2019 |
| Final Report Submission | Researcher | August, 2019 |

**APPENDIX H: DOCUMENTARY REVIEW CHECK LIST**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document list** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Percentage of children who eat lunch at school (Head teacher’s reports ) |  |  |  |
| Learners attendance to lessons (register) |  |  |  |
| Percentage of learners who drop out of school per year (Head teacher’s reports) |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who pay additional fees(Bursar’s records)  |  |  |  |
| Most committed indiscipline cases at school(Disciplinary reports) |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX I: BUDGET FOR THE STUDY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **QUANTITY** | **AMOUNT(UGX)** |
| Stationery | Two reams | 45,000 |
| Printing and Publication | 02copies\*20,000 | 40,000 |
| Administrative Research Cost | 01 | 100,000 |
| SPSS management | 01 | 300,000 |
| Transport and Communication ( FIELD COST) | 02times\*100,000 | 200,000 |
| Miscellaneous | - | 75,000 |
| **TOTAL** |  | **760,000** |

**APPENDIX J: KREJCIE AND MORGAN TABLE**

**TABLE FOR DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE FROM A GIVEN POPULATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **N** | **S** | **N** | **S** | **N** | **S** |
| 10 | 10 | 220 | 140 | 1200 | 291 |
| 15 | 14 | 230 | 144 | 1300 | 297 |
| 20 | 19 | 240 | 148 | 1400 | 302 |
| 25 | 24 | 250 | 152 | 1500 | 306 |
| 30 | 28 | 260 | 155 | 1600 | 310 |
| 35 | 32 | 270 | 159 | 1700 | 313 |
| 40 | 36 | 280 | 162 | 1800 | 317 |
| 45 | 40 | 290 | 165 | 1900 | 320 |
| 50 | 44 | 300 | 169 | 2000 | 322 |
| 55 | 48 | 320 | 175 | 2200 | 327 |
| 60 | 52 | 340 | 181 | 2400 | 331 |
| 65 | 56 | 360 | 186 | 2600 | 335 |
| 70 | 59 | 380 | 191 | 2800 | 338 |
| 75 | 63 | 400 | 196 | 3000 | 341 |
| 80 | 66 | 420 | 201 | 3500 | 346 |
| 85 | 70 | 440 | 205 | 4000 | 351 |
| 90 | 73 | 460 | 210 | 4500 | 354 |
| 95 | 76 | 480 | 214 | 5000 | 357 |
| 100 | 80 | 500 | 217 | 6000 | 361 |
| 110 | 86 | 550 | 226 | 7000 | 364 |
| 120 | 92 | 600 | 234 | 8000 | 367 |
| 130 | 97 | 650 | 242 | 9000 | 368 |
| 140 | 103 | 700 | 248 | 10000 | 370 |
| 150 | 108 | 750 | 254 | 15000 | 375 |
| 160 | 113 | 800 | 260 | 20000 | 377 |
| 170 | 118 | 850 | 265 | 30000 | 379 |
| 180 | 123 | 900 | 269 | 40000 | 380 |
| 190 | 127 | 950 | 274 | 50000 | 381 |
| 200 | 132 | 1000 | 278 | 75000 | 382 |
| 210 | 136 | 1100 | 285 | 100000 | 385 |